THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Edited by
G. Johannes Botterweck
Helmer Ringgren
Heinz-Josef Fabry

VOLUME XIV

Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
Volume 14
Translated from
Theologisches Wörterbuch zum alten Testament
Band VII, Lieferungen 6-11
Published 1992-93 by
Verlag W. Kohlhammer GmbH, Stuttgart, Germany

Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
255 Jefferson Ave. S.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503 /
P.O. Box 163, Cambridge CB3 9PU U.K.

Printed in the United States of America

11 10 09 08 07 06 05 04 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Botterweck, G. Johannes
Theological dictionary of the Old Testament
Translation of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.
Translated by David E. Green and Douglas W. Stott
Includes rev. ed. of v. 1-2.
Includes bibliographical references.
1. Bible. O.T. — Dictionaries — Hebrew. 2. Hebrew language — Dictionaries — English.
I. Ringgren, Helmer, 1917 — joint author. II. Fabry, Heinz-Josef — joint author.
III. Title.
ISBN 0-8028-2338-6 (set)

Volume XIV ISBN 0-8028-2345-9

www.eerdmans.com

CONTENTS

Abbreviations

AAAS	*Annales archéologiques Arabes Syriennes,* Damascus
AANLR	*Atti dell' Academia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti,* Rome
ÄAT	*Ägypten und Altes Testament: Studien zur Geschichte, Kultur und Religion Ägyptens und des AT*
AB	*Anchor Bible,* ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman, Garden City, N.Y.
AbB	*Altbabylonische Briefe,* Leiden
ABL	R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters,* 14 vols. (Chicago, 1892-1914)
ABLAK	M. Noth, *Aufsätze und biblischen Lander- und Altertumskunde,* 2 vols. (Neukirchen, 1971)
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review,* Melbourne
AbrN	*Abr-Nahrain,* Leiden
abs.	absolute
acc.	accusative
AcOr	*Acta orientalia,* Copenhagen, Leiden
act.	active
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb, adverbial
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung,* Graz
ÄgAbh	*Ägyptologische Abhandlungen,* Wiesbaden
AHw	W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch,* 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1965-81)
AION	*Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientali di Napoli*
AJBI	*Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute,* Tokyo
AJSL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures,* Chicago
AKG	*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte,* Berlin
Akk.	Akkadian
Amhar.	Amharic
Amor.	Amorite
AN	J. J. Stamm, *Die akkadische Namengebung. MVÄG* 44 (1939)
AnAcScFen	*Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae,* Helsinki
AnBibl	*Analecta biblica,* Rome
AncIsr	R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (Eng. trans., New York, 1961, repr. 1965)
ANEP	*Ancient Near East in Pictures,* ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, 1954, [2]1969)
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the OT,* ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, [2]1955, [3]1969)
ANH	G. Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch* (Göttingen, [2]1922, [3]1938)
AnLov	*Analecta lovaniensia biblica et orientalia*
AnOr	*Analecta orientalia,* Rome
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Berlin, 1972–)
AnSt	*Anatolian Studies,* London
AO	*Der Alte Orient,* Leipzig
AOAT	*Alter Orient und AT,* Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn
AOB	*Altorientalische Bilder zum AT,* ed. H. Gressmann (Berlin, [2]1927)

AOS	*American Oriental Series,* New Haven
AOT	*Altorientalische Texte zum AT,* ed. H. Gressmann (Berlin, [2]1926, repr. 1953)
AP	A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1923, repr. Osnabrück, 1976)
APN	K. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names. AnAcScFen* 43/1 (1914, repr. 1966)
APNM	H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, 1965)
Arab.	Arabic
Aram.	Aramaic
ARM	*Archives royales de Mari. Textes cunéiformes,* Paris
ArOr	*Archiv orientální,* Prague
ARW	*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft,* Freiburg, Leipzig, Berlin
AS	*Assyriological Studies,* Chicago
ASGW	*Abhandlungen der Sächischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften,* Leipzig
ASORDS	*American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation Series*
ASTI	*Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem,* Leiden
AT	Altes Testament, Ancien Testament, etc.
ATA	*Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen,* Münster
ATANT	*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Zurich
ATD	*Das AT Deutsch,* ed. V. Herntrich and A. Weiser, Göttingen
ATDA	J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij, *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla* (Leiden, 1976)
ATR	*Anglican Theological Review,* Evanston
ATS	*Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im AT,* St. Ottilien, Munich
Aug	*Augustinianum,* Rome
AuS	G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina,* 7 vols. (1928-42, repr. Hildesheim, 1964)
AUSS	*Andrews University Seminary Studies,* Berrien Springs, Mich.
AV	Authorized (King James) Version
AzT	*Arbeiten zur Theologie,* Stuttgart
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, Atlanta
Bab.	Babylonian, Babylonian Talmud
BAfO	*Beiheft zur AfO*
BAGD	W. Bauer et al., *Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, [2]1979)
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review,* Washington, D.C.
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, Baltimore
BBB	*Bonner biblische Beiträge*
BBET	*Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie*
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT* (Oxford, 1907; Peabody, Mass., [2]1979)
BEATAJ	*Beiträge zur Erforschung des ATs und des antiken Judentums,* Frankfurt am Main
Beeston	A. F. L. Beeston et al., *Sabaic Dictionary* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982)
Benz	F. L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions. StPohl* 8 (1972)
BeO	*Bibbia e Oriente,* Milan
Bergsträsser	G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik,* 2 vols. (1918-29; repr. Darmstadt, 1985)
BethM	*Beth Miqra,* Jerusalem
BETL	*Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium,* Paris, Gembloux
BEvT	*Beiträge zur evangelische Theologie,* Munich
Beyer	K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen, 1984)

BFCT	*Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie,* Gütersloh
BHHW	*Biblisch-historisches Handwörterbuch,* ed. L. Rost and B. Reicke, 4 vols. (Göttingen, 1962-66; index and maps, 1979)
BHK	*Biblia hebraica,* ed. R. Kittel (Stuttgart, [3]1929)
BHS	*Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia,* ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart, 1966-77)
BHT	*Beiträge zur historischen Theologie,* Tübingen
BI	*Biblical Illustrator*
Bibl	*Biblica,* Rome
bibliog.	bibliography
Biella	J. Biella, *Dictionary of Old South Arabic, Sabaean Dialect. HSS* 25 (1982)
BietOr	*Biblica et orientalia,* Rome
BIFAO	*Bulletin de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale,* Cairo
BiKi	*Bibel und Kirche,* Stuttgart
BiLe	*Bibel und Leben,* Düsseldorf
BiLi	*Bibel und Liturgie,* Klosterneuberg
BiOr	*Bibliotheca orientalis,* Leiden
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Manchester
BK	*Biblischer Kommentar AT,* ed. M. Noth and H. W. Wolff, Neukirchen-Vluyn
BL	*Bibel-Lexikon,* ed. H. Haag (Einsiedeln, 1951, [2]1968)
BLe	H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des ATs* (1918-22, repr. Hildesheim, 1991)
BMAP	E. G. Kraeling, *Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (New Haven, 1953)
BN	*Biblische Notizen,* Bamberg
BOT	*De Boeken van het OT,* Roermond en Maaseik
BRL	K. Galling, *Biblisches Reallexikon. HAT* (1937, [2]1977)
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* London
BSt	*Biblische Studien,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
BT	*Bible Translator,* London
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin,* Rome
BThS	*Biblisch-theologische Studien,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
BWA(N)T	*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament,* Leipzig, Stuttgart
BWL	W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford, 1960)
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift,* Paderborn
BZfr	*Biblische Zeitfragen,* Münster
BZAW	*Beihefte zur ZAW,* Berlin
BZNW	*Beihefte zur ZNW,* Berlin
ca.	circa, about
CAD	*Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (1956–)
CahRB	*Cahiers de la RB,* Paris
Can.	Canaanite
CAT	*Commentaire de l'AT,* Neuchâtel
CBC	*Cambridge Bible Commentary*
CBOT	*Coniectanea biblica, OT Series,* Lund
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* Washington
CBQMS	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series*
CC	*Continental Commentary,* Minneapolis
CD A,B	Damascus document, manuscript A, B
cf.	compare, see
ch(s).	chapter(s)
CH	Code of Hammurabi

ChW	J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1867-68, repr. 1959)
CIH	*Corpus inscriptionum himjariticarum* (= *CIS,* IV)
CIJ	*Corpus inscriptionum judaicarum* (Vatican, 1936–)
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* (Berlin, 1862–)
CIS	*Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum* (Paris, 1881–)
cj.	conjecture
CML	G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh, 1956; [2]1978, ed. J. C. L. Gibson)
col.	column
comm(s).	commentary(ies), commentator(s)
consec.	consecutive
const.	construct
ContiRossini	K. Conti Rossini, *Chrestomathia arabica meridionalis epigraphica* (Rome, 1931)
Copt.	Coptic
corr.	correction, corrected
COT	*Commentaar op het OT,* Kampen
CPT	J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the OT* (Oxford, 1968)
CRAI	*Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres,* Paris
CSD	R. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford, 1903, repr. 1976)
CT	*Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum,* London
CTA	A. Herdner, *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1963)
CThM	*Calwer theologische Monographien,* Stuttgart
D	Deuteronomist source
D	D (doubling) stem
DAWB	*Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft*
DB	*Dictionnaire de la Bible,* ed. F. Vigouroux (Paris, 1895-1912)
DBAT	*Dielheimer Blätter zum AT*
DBS	*Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément,* ed. L. Pirot et al. (Paris, 1926–)
dir.	direct
diss.	dissertation
DJD	*Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (Oxford, 1955–)
DMOA	*Documenta et monumenta orientis antiqui,* Leiden
DN	divine name
DNSI	J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions,* 2 vols. (Leiden, 1995)
Dtn	Deuteronomic (source)
Dtr	Deuteronomistic (source)
DtrN	nomistic Deuteronomistic source
DtrP	prophetic Deuteronomistic redactor
E	Elohistic source
EA	Tell el-Amarna tablets
EB	*Die Heilige Schrift in deutscher Übersetzung. Echter-Bibel,* Würzburg
ÉBib	*Études bibliques,* Paris
ed.	edition, editor
EdF	*Erträge der Forschung,* Darmstadt
EgT	*Église et théologie*

Egyp.	Egyptian
EH	*Europäische Hochschulschriften,* Frankfurt, Bern
EHAT	*Exegetisches Handbuch zum AT,* Münster
EMiqr	*Enṣiqlōpedyā miqrā'it (Encyclopedia Biblica)* (Jerusalem, 1950–)
emph.	emphatic
EncJud	*Encyclopaedia judaica,* 16 vols. (Jerusalem, New York, 1971-72)
EnEl	Enuma Elish
Eng.	English
Erg.	Ergänzungsheft, Ergänzungsreihe, Ergänzungsband
ErIsr	*Eretz-Israel,* Jerusalem
ESE	M. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik* (1900-1915)
esp.	especially
EstBíb	*Estudios bíblicos,* Madrid
Eth.	Ethiopic
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses,* Louvain
ETR	*Études théologiques et religieuses,* Montpellier
EÜ	Einheitsübersetzung der Heilige Schrift (Stuttgart, 1974-80)
Even-Shoshan	A. Even-Shoshan, *New Concordance of the Bible* (Jerusalem, [4]1983)
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie,* Munich
ExpT	*Expository Times,* Edinburgh
fem.	feminine
fig(s).	figure(s)
fr(s).	fragment(s)
FRLANT	*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Göttingen
FS	Festschrift
FThSt	*Freiburger theologischer Studien*
FzB	*Forschung zur Bibel,* Würzburg
G, Gtn	basic *(Grund)* stem, reflexive stem
GaG	W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik. AnOr* 33 (1952, [2]1969 [with Erg., *AnOr* 47])
Ger.	German
GesB	W. Gesenius and F. Buhl, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT* (Berlin, [17]1921, [18]1987–)
GesTh	W. Gesenius, *Thesaurus philologicus criticus linguae hebraeae et chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti,* 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1829-58)
Gilg.	Gilgamesh epic
Gk.	Greek
GK	W. Gesenius and E. Kautsch, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Halle, [28]1909) (= Kautsch and A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* [Oxford, [2]1910])
GLECS	*Comptes rendus du groupe linguistique d'études chamito-sémitiques,* Paris
GSAT	*Gesammelte Studien zum AT*
GTA	*Göttinger theologische Arbeiten*
GTTOT	J. J. Simons, *Geographical and Topographical Texts of the OT* (Leiden, 1959)
H	Holiness Code
Habil.	Habilitationschrift
HAL	L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, et al., *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT,* 5 vols. plus Sup (Eng. trans., Leiden, 1994-2000)
HAR	*Hebrew Annual Review,* Columbus, Ohio
HAT	*Handbuch zum AT,* ser. 1, ed. O. Eissfeldt, Tübingen
HDB	F. C. Grant and H. H. Rowley, eds., *Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible* (New York, [2]1963)
Heb.	Hebrew

Hen	*Henoch*
Herm	*Hermeneia,* Philadelphia, Minneapolis
Hitt.	Hittite
HKAT	*Handkommentar zum AT,* ed. W. Nowack, Göttingen
HO	*Handbuch der Orientalistik,* Leiden
HP	E. Jenni, *Das hebräische Pi'el* (Zurich, 1968)
HS	*Die Heilige Schrift des ATs,* ed. F. Feldmann and H. Herkenne, 8 vols. (Bonn, 1930-31)
HSAT	*Die Heilige Schrift des ATs,* ed. E. Kautsch and A. Bertholet, 4 vols. (Tübingen, ^{4}1922-23)
HSM	*Harvard Semitic Monographs,* Cambridge
HSS	*Harvard Semitic Series/Studies,* Cambridge; Missoula, Mont.; Chico, Calif.; Atlanta
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review,* Cambridge
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual,* Cincinnati
IB	*Interpreter's Bible,* ed. G. A. Buttrick, 12 vols. (Nashville, 1952-57)
IBHS	B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Intro. to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1990)
ICC	*International Critical Commentary,* Edinburgh
IDAM	*Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums*
IDB	*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* ed. G. A. Buttrick, 4 vols. (Nashville, 1962); *Sup,* ed. K. Crim (Nashville, 1976)
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal,* Jerusalem
ILC	J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture,* 4 vols. in 2 (Eng. trans., Oxford, 1926-40, ^{5}1963)
ill(s).	illustration(s)
impf.	imperfect(ive)
impv.	imperative
inf.	infinitive
in loc.	on this passage
Int	*Interpretation,* Richmond
intrans.	intransitive
Intro(s).	Introduction(s) (to the)
IOS	*Israel Oriental Studies,* Tel Aviv
IPN	M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung. BWANT* 46[III/10] (1928, repr. 1980)
J	Yahwist source (J^{1}, earliest Yahwist source; J^{S}, secondary Yahwist source)
JAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum,* Münster
Jamme	OSA inscriptions numbered according to A. Jamme
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University,* New York
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society,* Baltimore, Boston, New Haven
JARCE	*Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt,* Boston
Jastrow	M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (1903; repr. 2 vols. in 1, Brooklyn, 1975)
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature,* Philadelphia; Missoula, Mont.; Chico, Calif.; Atlanta
JBLMS	*Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies,* New Haven, Cambridge, Philadelphia, Baltimore
JE	Yahwist-Elohist source
JEOL	*Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux,"* Leiden

Jer.	Jerusalem (Palestinian) Talmud
JESHO	*Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient,* London
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies,* London
JM	P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Subsidia biblica* 14/I-II (Eng. trans. 1991)
JMEOS	*Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*
JMUOS	*Journal of the Manchester University and Oriental Society*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* Chicago
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages,* Stellenbosch
JPOS	*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society,* Jerusalem
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review,* Philadelphia
JSHRZ	*Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit,* Gütersloh
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the OT,* Sheffield
JSOTSup	*Journal for the Study of the OT, Supplement,* Sheffield
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies,* Manchester
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies,* Oxford
Jud	*Judaica,* Zurich
K	*Kethibh*
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften,* 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, ^{2}1966-69, ^{3}1971-76)
KAT	*Kommentar zum AT,* ed. E. Sellin and J. Herrmann, Leipzig, Gütersloh
KBL	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, ^{1}1953, ^{2}1958, ^{3}1967–96)
KD	C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the OT,* 10 vols. (Eng. trans., repr. Grand Rapids, 1954)
KEHAT	*Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum AT,* ed. O. F. Fridelin (Leipzig, 1812-96)
KHC	*Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum AT,* ed. K. Marti, Freiburg/Leipzig/Tübingen
KlPauly	*Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike,* ed. K. Ziegler and W. Sontheimer, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1962-75)
KlSchr	*Kleine Schriften* (A. Alt [Munich, 1953-59, ^{3}1964]; O. Eissfeldt [Tübingen, 1962-79]; K. Elliger [*ThB* 32 (1966)]; E. Meyer [Halle, 1910-24])
König	E. König, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1910; ^{6,7}1937)
KTU	*Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit,* I, ed. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. *AOAT* 24 (1976)
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma,* Göttingen
Kuhn	K. G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen, 1960); Nachträge, *RevQ* 4 (1963-64) 163-234
l(l).	line(s)
Lane	E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon,* 8 vols. (London, 1863-93, repr. 1968)
LAPO	*Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient,* Paris
Lat.	Latin
LD	*Lectio divina,* Paris
Leslau, *Contributions*	W. Leslau, *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon* (Los Angeles, 1958)
Leš	*Lešonénu,* Jerusalem
LexÄg	W. Helck and E. Otto, eds., *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* (Wiesbaden, 1975–)
LexHebAram	F. Zorell, *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum Veteris Testamenti* (Rome, 1958, repr. 1968)
LexLingAeth	A. Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae* (Leipzig, 1865)

LexSyr — C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon syriacum* (Halle, 1928, ^{2}1968)

Lisowsky — G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen AT* (Stuttgart, 1958, ^{2}1966)

lit. — literally

Lohse — E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, ^{2}1971)

LOT — Z. Ben Ḥayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans* (Jerusalem, 1957)

LSJ — H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, ^{9}1940)

LSSt — *Leipziger semitische Studien*

LThK — *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* ed. M. Buchberger, 10 vols. (Freiburg, 1930-38); ed. J. Höfer and K. Rahner, 10 vols. and 3 sups (^{2}1957-68, ^{3}1966-68)

LUÅ — *Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*

LXX — Septuagint (LXX^{A}, Codex Alexandrinus; LXX^{B}, Codex Vaticanus; LXX^{Or}, Origen; LXX^{L}, Lucianic recension; LXX^{Vn}, Aldine ed.; LXX$^{S[1,2]}$, Codex Sinaiticus, correctors 1, 2, etc.)

Mand. — Mandaic

Mandelkern — S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae* (Tel Aviv, 1971)

MAOG — *Mitteilungen der Altorientlistischen Gesellschaft,* Leipzig

masc. — masculine

MdD — E. S. Drower and R. Macuch, *Mandaic Dictionary* (Oxford, 1963)

MDOG — *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orientgesellschaft,* Berlin

MEOL — *Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux,"* Leiden

Meyer — R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik,* 4 vols. (Berlin, ^{3}1966-72)

mg. — margin

MGKK — *Monatsschrift für Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst*

MGWJ — *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums,* Breslau

Michel — D. Michel, *Grundlegung einer hebräischen Syntax,* I (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977)

Midr. — Midrash

MIO — *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung,* Berlin

Mish. — Mishnah

Moab. — Moabite

MRS — *Mission de Ras Shamra,* Paris

ms(s). — manuscript(s)

MSL — *Materialen zum sumerischen Lexikon,* Rome

MüSt — *Münsterschwarzacher Studien*

MT — Masoretic Text

MTS — *Münchener theologische Studien,* Munich

Mur — Wadi Murabbaʿat text(s)

Mus — *Muséon,* Louvain

MUSJ — *Mélanges de l'Université St.-Joseph,* Beirut

MVÄG — *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft,* Berlin, Leipzig

n(n). — note(s)

N, Ntn — passive, reflexive stem

Nabat. — Nabatean

NBL — *Neues Bibel-Lexikon,* ed. M. Görg (Zurich, 1991)

NBSS — T. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strassburg, 1910)

NCBC — *New Century Bible Commentary,* Grand Rapids and London

NEB — *Die Neue Echter-Bibel,* Würzburg

NedTT — *Nederlands theologisch Tijdschrift,* Wageningen

NESE	R. Degen, W. W. Müller, and W. Röllig, *Neue Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik,* 1972-78
NGTT	*Nederduitse gereformeerde teologiese tydskrif,* Capetown
NICOT	*New International Commentary on the OT,* Grand Rapids
no(s).	number(s)
NovTSup	*Novum Testamentum Supplements,* Leiden
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version (New York, 1989)
NRT	*Nouvelle revue théologique,* Louvain, Paris
NSS	J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* ([2]1894, repr. Hildesheim, 1967)
NT	New Testament, Neues Testament, etc.
NTOA	*Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus,* Fribourg, etc.
NTT	*Norsk teologisk Tidsskrift,* Oslo
OAC	*Orientis antiqui collectio,* Rome
obj.	object
OBO	*Orbis biblicus et orientalis,* Fribourg, Göttingen
OBT	*Overtures to Biblical Theology,* Philadelphia, Minneapolis
obv.	obverse of a papyrus or tablet
OIP	*Oriental Institute Publications,* Chicago
OL	Old Latin (OL^S, Fragmenta Sangallensia Prophetarum)
OLA	*Orientalia lovaniensia analecta,* Louvain
OLP	*Orientalia lovaniensa periodica,* Louvain
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig, Berlin
Or	*Orientalia,* Rome
OrAnt	Oriens antiquus, Rome
OrS	*Orientalia Suecana,* Uppsala
OSA	Old South Arabic
OT	Old Testament, Oude Testament, etc.
OTL	*Old Testament Library,* Philadelphia, Louisville
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studiën,* Leiden
OTWSA	*Ou testamentiese werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika,* Pretoria
p(p).	page(s)
P	Priestly source (P^G, Priestly *Grundschrift* ["basic material"]; P^S, secondary Priestly source)
PAAJR	*Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research,* Philadelphia
Palmyr.	Palmyrene
Pap.	Papyrus
par.	parallel/and parallel passages
pass.	passive
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly,* London
Pes.	Pesiqta
Pesh.	Peshitta
pf.	perfect(ive)
Phil.-hist. Kl.	Philosophische-historische Klasse
Phoen.	Phoenician
PJ	*Palästinajahrbuch,* Berlin
pl(s).	plate(s)
pl.	plural
PLO	*Porta linguarum orientalium,* Wiesbaden
PN	personal name
PNPI	J. K. Stark, *Personal Names in Palmyrene Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1971)
PNU	F. Grondähl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit. StPohl* 1 (1967)
POS	*Pretoria Oriental Series,* Leiden

POT	*De Prediking van het OT,* Nijkerk
prep(s).	preposition(s)
PRU	*Le Palais royal d'Ugarit,* ed. C. F.-A. Schaeffer and J. Nougayrol. *MRS*
ptcp.	participle
PTMS	*Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series*
Pun.	Punic
PW	A. Pauly and G. Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft,* 6 vols. (Stuttgart, 1839-52); Sup, 11 vols. (1903-56); ser. 2, 10 vols. (1914-48)
Pyr.	K. Sethe, *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte,* 4 vols. (Leipzig, 1908-22)
Q	Qumran scroll (preceded by arabic numeral designating cave)
Q	*Qere*
Qad	*Qadmoniot,* Jerusalem
QD	*Quaestiones disputatae,* Florence
QuadSem	*Quaderni di semitistica,* Florence
r.	reverse (side of a tablet, coin, etc.)
R	Redactor (R^D, Deuteronomistic; R^P, Priestly; R^J, Yahwist; R^H, Holiness Code)
RA	*Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale,* Paris
Rab.	Rabbah (midrashic commentary)
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* ed. T. Klauser (Stuttgart, 1950–)
Rahlfs	A. Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart, 1935)
RAI	*Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale,* Paris
RÄR	H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1952, ^{2}1971)
RB	*Revue biblique,* Paris
RBL	*Reclams Bibellexikon,* ed. K. Koch et al. (Stuttgart, ^{4}1987)
RE	*Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* ed. A. Hauck, 24 vols. (Leipzig, ^{3}1896-1913)
REJ	*Revue des études juives,* Paris
repr.	reprint, reprinted
RES	*Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique* (Paris, 1900–) (with number of text)
rev.	revised, revision
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân,* Paris
RGG	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Tübingen, ^{2}1927-31, ed. H. Gunkel and L. Zscharnack, 5 vols.; ^{3}1957-65, ed. K. Galling, 6 vols.)
RHB	A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel* (Leipzig, 1908ff.)
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses,* Strasbourg, Paris
RivB	*Rivista biblica,* Rome, Brescia, etc.
RLA	*Reallexikon der Assyriologie,* ed. E. Ebeling and B. Meissner (Berlin, 1932–)
RM	*Die Religion der Menschheit,* Stuttgart
RS	Ras Shamra text
RSF	*Revista di studi fenici*
RSO	*Rivista degli studi orientali,* Rome
RSP	*Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible,* ed. L. R. Fisher et al., I, *AnOr* 49 (1972); II, *AnOr* 50 (1975); III, *AnOr* 51 (1981)
RSPT	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Paris
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris
RST	*Regensburger Studien zur Theologie*
Ryckmans	G. Ryckmans, *Les noms propres sud-sémitiques,* 3 vols. (Leiden, 1934-35)
S	superscription (to Psalms)
Sab.	Sabaic

Saf. Safaitic
SAHG A. Falkenstein and W. von Soden, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebeten* (Zurich, 1953)
Sam. Samaritan
SANT *Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Munich
SAOC *Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization,* Chicago
SAT *Die Schriften des ATs in Auswahl,* ed. H. Gunkel and H. Gressmann, 7 vols. (Göttingen, [2]1920-22)
SB *Sources bibliques,* Paris
SBAB *Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände*
SBB *Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge*
SBFLA *Studii biblici franciscani liber annus,* Jerusalem
SBL Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS *SBL Dissertation Series,* Missoula, Mont.; Chico, Calif.; Atlanta
SBLMS *SBL Monograph Series,* Missoula, Mont.; Chico, Calif.; Atlanta
SBLSBS *SBL Sources for Biblical Study,* Missoula, Mont.; Chico, Calif.; Atlanta
SBM *Stuttgarter biblische Monographien*
SBS *Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien*
SBT *Studies in Biblical Theology,* London, Naperville
ScrHier *Scripta hierosolymitana,* Jerusalem
SEÅ *Svensk exegetisk Åarsbok,* Lund
SEL *Studi epigraphici e linguistici,* Rome, Verona
Sem. Semitic
Sem *Semitica,* Paris
Seux J. M. Seux, *Epithètes royales akkadiens et sumériennes* (Paris, 1967)
sg. singular
SGV *Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften,* Tübingen
SJLA *Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity,* Leiden
SJT *Scottish Journal of Theology,* Edinburgh
SNVAO *Skrifter utgitt av der norske videnskaps-akademi i Oslo*
Soq. Soqoṭri
SR *Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses,* Toronto
SS *Studi semitici,* Rome
SSAW *Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig,* Phil.-hist. Kl.
SSN *Studia semitica neerlandica,* Assen
st. status, state
ST *Studia theologica,* Lund, Århus, Riga
St.-B. H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch,* 6 vols. (Munich, 1922-61)
StBib *Studia biblica,* Leiden
STDJ *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah,* Leiden, Grand Rapids
StOr *Studia orientalia,* Helsinki
StPohl *Studia Pohl,* Rome
SS *Studi Semitici,* Rome
subj. subject
subst. substantive, substantival
suf. suffix
Sum. Sumerian
Sup Supplement(s) (to)
s.v. *sub voce (vocibus),* under the word(s)
SVT *Supplements to VT,* Leiden
SWBA *Social World of Biblical Antiquity,* Sheffield

Synt	C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1956)
Syr.	Syriac
Syr	*Syria. Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie,* Paris
T.	Testament
TADAE	*Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt,* ed. B. Porten and A. Yardeni, 4 vols. (Jerusalem, 1986-99)
TBT	*The Bible Today,* Collegeville, Minn.
TCL	*Textes cunéiformes du Louvre*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the NT,* ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 9 vols. plus index vol. (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1964-76)
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the OT,* ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1974–)
Tg(s).	Targum(s); Frag. Tg., Fragmentary Targum; Pal. Tg., Palestinian Targum; Tg. Jon., Targum Jonathan from Codex Reuchlinianus; Tg. Neof., Targum Neofiti; Tg. Onq., Targum Onqelos; Tg. Ps.-J., Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
TGI	K. Galling, *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels* (Tübingen, 1950, [2]1968, [3]1979)
ThArb	*Theologische Arbeiten,* Berlin
Tham.	Thamudic
ThAT	*Theologie des ATs*
ThB	*Theologische Bücherei,* Munich
ThS	*Theologische Studien,* Zurich
ThV	*Theologische Versuche,* Berlin
Tigr.	Tigriña
TLOT	*Theological Lexicon of the OT,* ed. E. Jenni and C. Westermann, 3 vols. (Eng. trans., Peabody, Mass., 1997)
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig, Berlin
TM	Tell Mardikh-Ebla tablets
TO	A. Caquot, M. Sznycer, and A. Herdner, *Textes ougaritiques. I. Mythes et légendes. LAPO,* 2 vols. (1974-89)
TOB	Traduction oecuménique de la Bible (Paris, 1983)
Tomback	R. S. Tomback, *A Comparative Lexicon of the Phoenician and Punic Languages. SBLDS* 32 (1978)
Tos.	Tosephta
trans.	translation, translated by; or, transitive
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie,* ed. G. Krause, G. Müller, and H. R. Balz, 22 vols. (Berlin, 1977-92)
TRev	*Theologische Revue,* Münster
TRu	*Theologische Rundschau,* Tübingen
TSK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* Hamburg, Gotha, Leipzig
TSSI	J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions,* 3 vols. (Oxford, 1975-82)
TTK	*Tidsskrift for teologi og kirke,* Oslo
TTS	*Trierer theologische Studien*
TTZ	*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*
TUAT	*Texte aus der Umwelt des ATs,* Gütersloh
TynB	*Tyndale Bulletin,* London
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basel
UBL	*Ugaritisch-biblische Literatur,* Münster
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
Ugar.	Ugaritic
Univ.	University
ÜPt	M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart, 1948)

Urk.	*Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums,* ed. G. Steindorff (Leipzig, Berlin, 1903–)
UT	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook. AnOr* 38 (1965, ²1967)
UUÅ	*Uppsala universitets årsskrift*
v(v).	verse(s)
VAB	*Vorderasiatische Bibliothek,* 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1907-16)
VAT	*Tablets in the Collection of the Staatlich Museen,* Berlin
vb.	verb
VD	*Verbum domini,* Rome
VG	C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen,* 2 vols. (1908-13, repr. Hildesheim, 1961)
Vg.	Vulgate
VT	*Vetus Testamentum,* Leiden
Wagner	M. Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch. BZAW* 96 (1966)
WbÄS	A. Erman and H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache,* 6 vols. (Leipzig, 1926-31, repr. 1963)
WBC	*Word Biblical Commentary,* Waco, Dallas, Nashville
WbMyth	*Wörterbuch der Mythologie,* ed. H. W. Haussig (Stuttgart, 1965–)
WbTigr	E. Littmann and M. Höfner, *Wörterbuch der Tigre Sprache* (Wiesbaden, 1962)
WdF	*Wege der Forschung,* Darmstadt
Wehr	H. Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic,* ed. J. M. Cowan (Ithaca, 1961, ³1971, ⁴1979)
Whitaker	R. E. Whitaker, *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Language* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972)
WMANT	*Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
WO	*Die Welt des Orients,* Göttingen
WTM	J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim,* 4 vols. (Leipzig, ²1924, repr. 1963)
WuD	*Wort und Dienst,* Bielefeld
WUS	J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache. BSAW,* Phil.-hist. Kl. 106/3 (1963, ⁴1974)
WZ Halle	*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg,* Halle
WZKM	*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
YOS	*Yale Oriental Series, Babylonian Texts*
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie,* Leipzig, Berlin
ZAH	*Zeitschrift für Althebräistik*
ZÄS	*Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde,* Leipzig, Berlin
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* Giessen, Berlin
ZB	Zürcher Bibel
ZBK	*Zürcher Bibelkommentare,* Zurich, Stuttgart
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* Leipzig, Wiesbaden
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins,* Leipzig, Stuttgart, Wiesbaden
Ziegler	J. Ziegler, ed., *Septuaginta* (Göttingen, 1931–)
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,* Giessen, Berlin
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche,* Tübingen
→	cross-reference within this Dictionary
<	derived from
>	whence derived, to
*	theoretical form

TRANSLITERATION

VOWELS

◌ַ	a
◌ֲ	^{a}
◌ָ	ā
◌ָה	â
◌ָיו	āyw
◌ַי	ay
◌ָי	āy
◌ֶ	e
◌ֱ	^{e}
◌ֶי	ey
◌ֵ	ē
◌ֵי	ê
◌ְ	^{e}
◌ִ	i
◌ִי	î
◌ִיּ	îy
◌ָ	o
◌ֳ	^{o}
◌ֹ	ō
וֹ	ô
◌ֻ	u, ū
וּ	û

CONSONANTS

א	'
בּ	b
ב	ḇ
גּ	g
ג	ḡ
דּ	d
ד	ḏ
ה, הּ	h
ו	w
ז	z
ח	ḥ
ט	ṭ
י	y
כּ, ךּ	k
כ, ך	ḵ
ל	l
מ, ם	m
נ, ן	n
ס	s
ע	'
פּ	p
פ, ף	p̄
צ, ץ	ṣ
ק	q
ר	r
שׂ	ś
שׁ	š
תּ	t
ת	ṯ

רָשַׁע *rāša'*; רָשָׁע *rāšā'*; רֶשַׁע *reša'*; רִשְׁעָה *riš'â*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. The Verb. III. *rāšā':* 1. Pentateuch; 2. Deuteronomistic History and Chronicler's History; 3. Prophets; 4. Psalms; 5. Proverbs; 6. Job; 7. Ecclesiastes. IV. *reša'* and *riš'â.* V. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The two Hebrew terms *rāša',* "be guilty," and *rāšā',* "guilty, wicked person,"[1] are related to Akk. *rešûm,* "inconsiderate, thoughtless";[2] Ugar. *rš';*[3] Syr. *reša',* "behave criminally" (similarly also Christian Palestinian Aramaic; cf. Jewish Aram. *raššî'ā',* "wicked person"); Eth. *ras'a,* "forget, commit an error";[4] and Arab. *rasa'a,* "have eyelids stuck together, limp members," as well as *rasi'a,* "be sick (eye)." Although the semantic development is not entirely clear, one can probably presuppose a basic meaning of "not be in order, not fulfill the anticipated function," from which the various specialized meanings then developed. The forensic meaning is peculiar to Hebrew, where the term is also characterized by polarity with the term → צדק *ṣdq/ṣaddîq.*

---

rāša'. R. Bergmeier, "Zum Ausdruck עצת רשעים in Ps 1, Hi 10,9; 21,18 und 22,18," *ZAW* 79 (1967) 229-32; O. Bächli, *Israel und die Völker. ATANT* 41 (1962), esp. 55-56; H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 (²1970); T. Donald, "The Semantic Field of Rich and Poor in the Wisdom Literature of Hebrew and Accadian," *OrAnt* 3 (1964) 27-41; K. H. Fahlgren, "Die Gegensätze von *ṣedāqā* im AT," in K. Koch, ed., *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des AT. WdF* 125 (1972), 87-129; H. Goeke, "Das Menschenbild der individuellen Klagelieder. Ein Beitrag zur alttestamentlichen Anthropologie" (diss., Bonn, 1971), esp. 43-44; P. Hugger, *Jahwe, meine Zuflucht. Münsterschwarzacher Studien* 13 (1971), esp. 213-21; R. Kassühlke, "Some Words of Special Religious Importance in OT Poetry," *BT* 30 (1979) 443-45; O. Keel, *Feinde und Gottesleugner. Studien zum Image der Widersacher in den Individualpsalmen. SBM* 7 (1969), esp. 109-31; A. Kuschke, "Arm und reich im AT mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der nachexilischen Zeit," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 31-57, esp. 44-57; C. van Leeuwen, "רשׁע *rš'* to be impious/guilty," *TLOT,* III, 1261-62; G. Many, "Der Rechtsstreit mit Gott (RIB) im Hiobbuch" (diss., Munich, 1970), esp. 136-43 (published in Sangmélima, Cameroon, 1971); J. Pedersen, *ILC,* I-II, esp. 418-19, 448; W. S. Prinsloo, "Psalm 1, die ṣaddiqîm en die reša'im," *NGTT* 22 (1981) 80-90; K. H. Richards, "A Form- and Traditio-Historical Study of רשׁע" (diss., Claremont, 1970); S. N. Rosenbaum, "The Concept 'Antagonist' in Hebrew Psalmography: A Semantic Field Study" (diss., Brandeis, 1974); L. Rost, "Erwägungen zu Sacharjas 7. Nachtgesicht," *ZAW* 58 (1940/41) 223-38 = idem, *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum AT* (Heidelberg, 1965), 70-76; H. Schmid, "'Gottlose' und Gottlosigkeit im AT," *Jud* 33 (1977) 75-85, 127-35; R. B. Y. Scott, "Wise and Foolish, Righteous and Wicked," *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel. SVT* 23 (1972), 146-65; U. Skladny, *Die ältesten Spruchsammlungen in Israel* (Göttingen, 1962).

1. See *HAL,* III, 1294-96.
2. *AHw,* II, 996.
3. Attested only in Ras Ibn Hani 78/20, l. 6, par. with *ḫṭ',* "wound [oneself]" or a similar meaning; cf. J. C. de Moor, "An Incantation against Evil Spirits," *UF* 12 (1980) 429; Y. Avishur, "The Ghost-Expelling Incantation from Ugarit," *UF* 13 (1981) 15.
4. *LexLingAeth,* 280.

2. *Occurrences.* The verb occurs in the OT 10 times in the qal and 25 times in the hiphil. Substantive-related constructions include *rāšā'*, "guilty, wicked, impious," often as the subst. "wicked person" (263 times), *reša,* "wrong, offense" (30 times), *riš'â,* "offense, guilt" (14 times), and *miršaʿaṯ,* "wickedness" (once).

II. The Verb. The forensic meaning comes to expression most clearly in the verb. Dt. 25:1 inculcates the universal principle that in a legal dispute[5] one should acquit (*ṣdq* hiphil) the innocent (the "righteous," *ṣaddîq*) and condemn (*rš'* hiphil) the guilty *(rāšā')* (similarly Prov. 17:15; cf. 18:5). Ex. 22:8(Eng. 9) addresses the special case in which someone is accused of theft; both accuser and accused come before God, and whomever God declares guilty (*rš'* hiphil) is to restore what has been lost. Solomon's prayer of dedication for the temple presupposes something similar in its assertion that when such a matter is brought before God, God is to condemn the guilty *(rš'* hiphil + *rāšā')* and vindicate the innocent *(ṣdq* hiphil + *ṣaddîq;* 1 K. 8:32; the par. 2 Ch. 6:23 uses *hāšîḇ lārāšā').* A passage in the third Servant Song also resonates with this forensic sense when the Servant says, among other things, that "he who vindicates me *(maṣdîq)* is near. Who will contend *(rîḇ)* with me? . . . It is the Lord Yahweh who helps me; who will declare me guilty (*rš'* hiphil)?" (Isa. 50:8-9).

Similar expressions occur in the book of Job. Job knows that God will not hold him innocent (*nqh* piel); although Job stands guilty as accused (*rš'* qal; Job 9:28-29), he does entreat God, "Do not condemn me (hiphil)" (10:2). Eliphaz says that Job's own words ("your own mouth") condemn him (15:6). Elihu accuses Job of condemning (*rš'* hiphil) him who is absolutely righteous (*ṣaddîq,* i.e., God) (34:17; cf. "who hates *mišpāṭ*" in v. 17a); cf. v. 29: "When he is quiet, who can condemn?" In his concluding discourse Yahweh says to Job: "Will you even put me in the wrong (*prr* hiphil)? Will you condemn me (*rš'* hiphil) that you may be justified (*ṣdq* qal)?" (40:8). It is presumptuous to accuse God of wrong and to present oneself as righteous.

Although the text of Ps. 94:21 is probably corrupt, it is clearly concerned with those who condemn (*rš'* hiphil) the innocent *(nāqî)* and righteous *(ṣaddîq).* Prov. 12:2 contrasts the way God shows favor *(rāṣôn)* to the good person while condemning (*rš'* hiphil) the devious. The assertion in Ps. 37:33 is purely forensic, namely, that God will not allow the righteous to be condemned in court.

The qal form, "be/become guilty," occurs, for example, in Job 10:7. God knows that Job is not guilty (cf. *'āwôn* and *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* in v. 6). The verb in vv. 14-15 also resonates forensically in its assertion that if Job sins *(ḥṭ'),* God will not acquit him (*nqh* piel) of his iniquity *('āwôn).* "If I am wicked *(rš'),* woe to me! If I am righteous *(ṣdq),* I (still) cannot lift up my head." Ps. 18:22(21) par. 2 S. 22:22 uses *rš'* as the antithesis to "keeping the ways of Yahweh." Eccl. 7:16-17 paradoxically warns against the foolishness of being either excessively righteous *(ṣdq)* or excessively wicked *(rš').* Is this an ironic admonition in favor of moderation, or is it suggesting that there is no just world order?

In the series *ḥāṭā'nû he'ᵉwînû rāšaʿnû* in the exiles' confession of sins (1 K. 8:47 par.

---

5. → ריב *rîḇ.*

2 Ch. 6:37), the verbs describe the various aspects of sin (expanded by *māradnû* and by other verb forms in Dnl. 9:5). The same applies to Ps. 106:6, where *rš'* hiphil assumes the reflexive sense of "make oneself guilty." According to Job 34:12, God "will not do wickedly" (*rš'* hiphil), nor does he "pervert justice." According to Dnl. 12:10, the *r^ešā'îm* will continue to act wickedly (hiphil) while many are purified, nor will the wicked understand, though the *maśkîlîm* will. Dnl. 11:32 speaks of the *maršî'ê b^erîṯ,* "those who violate the covenant."

III. *rāšā'*. Rost suggests that in the OT *rāšā'* refers primarily to those who "on the basis of their deeds should expect to be declared guilty in court."[6] Although this assertion does indeed apply to most of the occurrences in prose texts, the examples in the Psalms and Proverbs especially represent an expanded and simultaneously deeper meaning. The best translation is "evildoer" or "wicked, godless person." Strikingly, witnesses in narrative texts are rare, while the Psalms and wisdom literature attest an extremely high number of occurrences.

1. *Pentateuch.* Most of the occurrences in the Pentateuch exhibit the forensic meaning. Abraham protests that God intends to destroy both the righteous *(ṣaddîq)* and the wicked *(rāšā')* in Sodom (Gen. 18:23,25[ter]). When Moses sees the two Israelites arguing, he reprimands the *rāšā',* i.e., the one who did wrong (Ex. 2:13). The Covenant Code forbids aiding a guilty person as a witness (Ex. 23:1) and warns against acquitting the guilty (Ex. 23:7). Dathan and Abiram are called *r^ešā'îm* because they rebelled against Moses (Nu. 16:26). The guilt of murder is punishable by death (Nu. 35:31). Dt. 25:1 confirms the principle that the guilty are to be condemned and the innocent acquitted; v. 2 provides an example. Only in Ex. 9:27 does the word possibly exhibit a religio-ethical sense when Pharaoh acknowledges both himself and his people as *rāšā',* adding: "we have sinned *(ḥṭ')*."

2. *Deuteronomistic History and Chronicler's History.* The term *rāšā'* is almost entirely absent from the historical works. Among the 5 occurrences in the Dtr History, one is found in the Song of Hannah (1 S. 2:9: the *r^ešā'îm* fall silent in the darkness; antithesis to *ḥāsîḏ*), while 1 S. 24:14(13) cites a proverb asserting that "out of the wicked comes forth wickedness." In 1 K. 8:32 (par. 2 Ch. 6:23) Solomon entreats Yahweh to condemn the *r^ešā'îm.* According to 2 S. 4:11, the *r^ešā'îm* (NRSV "wicked men") have killed a righteous man *(ṣaddîq).*

Apart from Solomon's prayer, the only occurrence in the Chronicler's History is 2 Ch. 19:2, where a prophet asks Jehoshaphat, "Should one help a *rāšā'*?" The parallel question defines the *rāšā'* as one who hates Yahweh.

3. *Prophets.* Although the term *rāšā'* occurs with striking infrequency in prophetic literature, a certain concentration does occur in three passages in Ezekiel, namely, in

6. Rost, 226.

the two parallel passages Ezk. 3:18-19 and 33:8-9 as well as in 18:19-29. The first passages mention how the prophet's task is to warn the *rāšāʿ* lest he die from his *ʿāwôn* (incidentally, *rāšāʿ* occurs here adjectivally as well in the expression *darkô hārᵉšāʿâ*). In the second instance, Ezekiel develops the notion that all are to be held accountable for their deeds. The *rāšāʿ* who turns away from his sins *(ḥṭʾ)* observes God's statutes *(ḥuqqôṯ)*, and does what is lawful and right will surely live rather than die (v. 21). God takes no pleasure in the death of the *rāšāʿ*, preferring rather that such a person turn away from wicked ways and live (v. 23; cf. also 33:11,14,19).

The *rᵉšāʿîm* in Ezk. 7:21 are foreigners *(zār)* who will plunder and desecrate Jerusalem. The false prophetesses dishearten the righteous and encourage the wicked (13:22), that is, they do exactly the opposite of what true prophets should do. According to 21:8-9, the sword will wipe out everyone, the righteous and the *rᵉšāʿîm* alike.

Of the 11 occurrences in Isaiah, 3 are found in Deutero-Isaiah and 2 in Trito-Isaiah. Isa. 3:11 recalls the wisdom tradition in its assertion that things will go badly for the wicked, with their deeds surely falling back upon them, whereas things will go quite differently for the righteous (v. 10). Isa. 5:23 invokes a cry of woe upon those who acquit the guilty. According to 11:4, the future king will kill the *rāšāʿ* by condemning him; because this passage portrays the king as a righteous judge, the term is probably to be understood forensically. The proclamation against Babylon in 13:11 says that Yahweh will punish *(pqd)* the world for its evil *(rāʿâ)* and the wicked for their iniquity *(ʿāwôn)*. It is worth noting that the passage goes on to speak of the *gᵉʾôn zēḏîm*, the "pride of the arrogant," and the *gaʾᵃwaṯ ʿārîṣîm*, the "insolence of tyrants." Isa. 14:5 tells how Yahweh has broken the staff of the wicked and the scepter of rulers. The wisdom tradition resonates yet again in 26:10, where the wicked do not learn righteousness even when they are shown favor (cf. Prov. 9:7), prompting Yahweh to intervene in judgment. Contextually it is worth noting how the wicked pervert justice and fail to see Yahweh's majesty *(gēʾûṯ)*. Deutero-Isaiah finds that the *rᵉšāʿîm* enjoy no *šālôm* (48:22), a notion recurring with commentary in 57:20-21, which says that the wicked "are like the tossing sea." According to 53:9, the grave of the Servant of God will be located among the *rᵉšāʿîm*. Isa. 55:7 challenges the *rāšāʿ* to forsake his way and return to Yahweh that he might find mercy. Given the context, the addressees would be those who do not believe that God can lead his people home from Babylon.

After the conspiracy against him, Jeremiah faces the problem of why the *rᵉšāʿîm* prosper, since, after all, Yahweh is righteous (12:1). According to 5:25-26, the people's own iniquities (par. "sins") have disrupted the natural order (the seasons). Wicked scoundrels walk about among the people and stalk others. According to 25:31, Yahweh indicts all nations, delivering the *rᵉšāʿîm* ("the guilty") over to the sword. Jer. 23:19 announces a storm that will burst upon the head of the wicked, namely, Yahweh's own wrath (repeated in 30:23).

Mic. 6:10 associates the *rᵉšāʿîm* with illegitimate profit. Hab. 1:4 says that the *rāšāʿ* surrounds the righteous and perverts justice. Hab. 1:13 assures us that God cannot simply stand by and watch while the *rāšāʿ* devours the righteous. Hab. 3:13 announces the punishment of the *rᵉšāʿîm*. Although the text of Zeph. 1:3 is uncertain, it is in any case concerned with the destruction of the wicked. Mal. 3:18 almost provides a definition in

its assertion that the righteous serves *(ʿāḇaḏ)* God, while the *rāšāʿ* does not; v. 21 predicts that the *rᵉšāʿîm* will be trampled.

4. *Psalms.* The Psalms mention the *rᵉšāʿîm* 82 times, generally as adversaries of the "righteous" *(ṣaddîqîm),* sometimes as *gôyîm* (foreign nations, 9:6,18[5,17]), and often parallel with enemies (*ʾôyᵉḇîm,* 3:8[7]; 17:9; 55:4[3]), workers of evil (*pōʿᵃlê ʾāwen,* 28:3; 92:8[7]; 101:8; 141:9-10), evildoers (*mᵉrēʿîm,* 26:5; 37:9-10), ruthless persons (*ḥômēṣ,* 71:4; *ʾōhēḇ ḥāmās,* 11:5; *ʾîš ḥᵃmāsîm,* 140:5[4]), transgressors (*pōšᵉʿîm,* 37:38), liars (*dōḇᵉrê kāzāḇ,* 58:4[3]; cf. 109:2), etc. They are characterized by pride and arrogance (*gʾh,* 94:2-3; *hōlᵉlîm,* 73:3; 75:5[4]). Ps. 1:1,5, and 104:35 call them "sinners," 1:1 also "scoffers" *(lēṣîm).* They are friends who have proven to be disloyal (55:4[3]; 109:2). Although they speak peace, they are planning mischief (28:3). They utter curses in their hiding places (10:7ff.; 17:9ff.; 140:9), dig pits and set nets as traps (7:16[15]; 9:16[15]; 10:9; 140:6[5]; 141:19). Ps. 10:3-11 seems to be describing their very nature when it says that they boast of their own desires and despise Yahweh in their arrogance *(gōḇah ʾap),* and think that "there is no God." They prosper in their ways, pay no attention to God's judgments, and believe that they will never stagger. Their mouths are filled with deceit and oppression, they talk mischief and iniquity, saying that "God has forgotten, . . . he will never see it." One can accordingly call them the "godless," since they do not take God into account, believing rather in their own strength; they withdraw from God's power and live by their own initiative, regarding neither Yahweh's deeds nor the work of his hands (Ps. 28:5).[7]

Ps. 73 provides a similar picture in its assertion that the wicked always prosper (v. 3), have no pain (vv. 4-5), and wear pride as a necklace and violence as a garment. They open their mouths to devour the world, speak arrogantly and with malice, and accept the praise of the people. They rely confidently on their wealth and then also say, "How can God know?" The psalmist counters with his own assurance that all this is merely deception, that God's punishment will catch up with the wicked; they will fall suddenly to ruin and come to a terrible end (vv. 18-20).

A similar notion permeates Ps. 37. The psalmist admonishes the reader to trust in God, for God helps the righteous. Even if the wicked are successful in everything they do (v. 7), that success lasts only a little while; soon they are no more (v. 10). Even if the wicked scheme against the righteous, Yahweh laughs at them, knowing that their day is coming (vv. 12-13). Even if they draw their sword, it shall enter their own heart (vv. 14-15). Hence "better is a little that the righteous person has than the abundance of many wicked. For the arms of the wicked shall be broken" (vv. 16-17). The wicked will perish and vanish like smoke (v. 20; cf. v. 28). The wicked may well lie in wait to kill the righteous (vv. 32,35), but suddenly they are no more (v. 36; cf. v. 38), for God delivers the righteous from the wicked.

In Ps. 1 the *rᵉšāʿîm* appear together with the *lēṣîm* (v. 1) and *ḥaṭṭāʾîm* (vv. 1,5) as the antithesis to those who keep the law, who in their own turn are compared to green,

---

7. See H. Ringgren, *Psalmen. Urban Taschenbücher* 120 (Stuttgart, 1971), 59-60.

fruit-bearing trees. Readers are admonished not to traffic with the wicked (v. 1; cf. 26:3-4), for they are like chaff before the wind (v. 4), are not successful in the court of judgment (v. 5), and perish (v. 6b), for Yahweh "watches over the way of the righteous" (v. 6a). Ps. 119 also portrays the *r^e^šā'îm* as adversaries of those who keep the law (vv. 53,61,95,119,155). Verse 155 is of particular interest in this context, since it offers a new definition. The wicked do not seek God's *ḥuqqîm* (cf. v. 53: they forsake God's *tôrâ*).

The remaining occurrences confirm this picture. The wicked are the enemies of the righteous believer (11:2; 17:9; 55:4[3]; 140:5,9[4,8]), are arrogant (36:12[11]; 75:11[10]), and prosper ("the wicked sprout like grass and all evildoers flourish," 92:8[7]). Though they do not fear *(pḥd)* God (36:2[1]), God's punishment will find them (3:8[7]; 11:2; 31:18[17]; etc.), and they will drink the cup of wrath (75:9[8]). The forensic meaning is found in 82:2 and 109:7.

5. *Proverbs.* According to the analysis of Skladny, of the 78 occurrences of *rāšā'* in the book of Proverbs, 39 are found in collection A (chs. 10–15), 13 in B (16:1–22:16), 2 in C (chs. 25–27), and 10 in D (chs. 28–29), i.e., primarily in proverbial material from the early monarchy. Almost all these proverbs use antithetical parallelism in portraying the contrast between the righteous *(ṣaddîq)* and the wicked *(rāšā')*. By contrast, W. McKane assigns these proverbs to the most recent, religiously influenced stratum of proverbial literature.[8] Since it is extremely doubtful, however, that there was any nonreligious wisdom in Israel in any case, such ascription will be difficult to prove.[9]

Like the *ḥāḵām-nāḇāl* sayings,[10] the *ṣaddîq-rāšā'* sayings are concerned with demonstrating the act-consequence nexus. It is noteworthy that they seldom describe the actual behavior of the wicked. We hear that "the mouth of the wicked conceals violence *(ḥāmās)*" (10:6,11), that they speak what is perverse (10:32), are deceitful (12:5) and lie in wait for blood (12:6), that their hearts are cruel (12:10), that they act shamefully and disgracefully (12:5), speak evil words (15:28), accept bribes and pervert justice (17:23; cf. 19:28), and are merciless (21:10). Their role in the life of society is noteworthy. Their deceptive words bring misfortune upon the city (11:11). Wherever the wicked prevail, "people go into hiding" (28:12,28) and groan (29:2; cf. also 29:16). According to 10:27, wickedness is the antithesis of fear of God. According to 21:27, the "sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination" (for Yahweh?), since it is not offered in sincerity, and their prayer is far from Yahweh (15:29). By contrast, 28:4 is probably not talking about the "law"; here *tôrâ* refers to "guidance, instruction."

These texts speak much more frequently about the consequences of wickedness. The wicked die through lack of sense (10:21). Precisely what they fear does indeed fall upon them (10:25). Their years are short (10:27), their hopes come to nothing (10:28; cf. 11:7). They will not remain in the land (10:30), their wickedness is repaid (11:31),

---

8. W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 10ff., and in loc.
9. See H. Ringgren, *Sprüche. ATD* 16/1 (^{3}1980), 12.
10. Skladny, 29-36, 50-54; cf. Ringgren, *Sprüche,* 46, 53-54, 57.

they are overthrown and are no more (12:7), their way leads them astray (12:26), their lamp is extinguished (13:9), they starve (13:25), their house is destroyed (14:11), etc.

The Egyptian-style proverbs (22:17–23:11) do not mention the *rᵉšāʻîm* at all. By contrast, the late introductory material (chs. 1–9) does contain some passages with a strong religious orientation. We read, for example, that "Yahweh's curse is on the house of the wicked," whereas he blesses the house of the righteous (3:33). "The wicked will be cut off from the land" (2:22; cf. 10:7,30). Like Ps. 1, so also does Prov. 4:14 warn against embarking upon the path of the wicked.

6. *Job.* Job calls into question the validity of the act-consequence nexus. God is unjust, Job asserts, and destroys both the blameless *(tām)* and the guilty *(rāšāʻ)* (9:22). Even though Job distances himself from the thinking of the wicked (21:16; 22:18), he has been cast into their hands (16:11); indeed, the whole world is in their power (9:24). Why, he asks, do they live and become even more powerful (21:7)? "How often is the lamp of the wicked put out? How often does calamity come upon them?" (21:17). Indeed, God allows their plans to succeed (10:3), and only in death does their raging cease (3:17).

Job's friends, however, defend the principle of act-consequence. "The tent of the wicked will be no more" (8:22); they have no way of escape (11:20) and live in constant fear (15:20). Their light will be extinguished (18:5; cf. 21:17 above), their rejoicing will be brief (20:5), and God will not keep them alive (36:6). This context probably also includes the deliberations in 27:7-23, which the MT ascribes to Job but which more likely represent part of Zophar's third discourse. Here we learn about the unfortunate fate of the wicked.

In the divine discourse, God ironically asks whether Job has power over darkness and light such that he might uncover and punish the wicked (38:13) and withhold light from them (38:15). If Job is indeed able to tread down the wicked, "then I [God] will also acknowledge to you that your own right hand can give you victory" (40:12,14). Job should not try to usurp God's position, for God and only God rules over the fate of the wicked.

7. *Ecclesiastes.* All 7 occurrences in Ecclesiastes are found in contexts calling into question the existence of any meaningful world order. Although the author does indeed cite the conventional view that God will judge both the righteous and the wicked (3:17) and that things will ultimately go well for the God-fearing and ill for the wicked (8:13),[11] in reality things are quite different. The righteous "are treated according to the conduct of the wicked," and vice versa (8:14 bis). The same fate comes to the righteous as to the wicked (9:2). The righteous perish, while the wicked "prolong their life in their evildoing" (7:15). The text of 8:10 is corrupt.[12]

---

11. According to A. Lauha, *Kohelet. BK* XIX (1978), 75, 157, these passages represent orthodox addenda intended to soften the pessimism of Ecclesiastes.

12. See ibid., 155-56.

IV. *reša'* and *riš'â*. The term *reša'* refers to the nature of the *rāšā'*, namely, "wickedness, wrong" (1 S. 24:14[13]), a nature such a person must abandon in order to remain alive (Ezk. 3:19; 33:12; *reša'* is interchangeable with *riš'â* in 18:20,27; 33:19). The word is used in construct expressions to characterize human beings (Job 34:8), deeds (Ps. 141:4; cf. Prov. 16:12), treasures (Prov. 10:2; Mic. 6:10), (dishonest) weights (Mic. 6:11), fetters (Isa. 58:6), fists (blows, Isa. 58:4), and scepter (Ps. 125:3). According to Prov. 8:7, *reša'* of the lips is the antithesis of truth. Prov. 4:17 says metaphorically that the wicked even eat *reša'*. Eccl. 3:16 invokes the forensic meaning with regard to dishonest judgment.

The term acquires a more pronounced religious coloring in Moses' intercession in Dt. 9:27, where he speaks of the stubbornness *(qᵉšî), reša'*, and sin of the people; and in Jer. 14:20, which associates *reša'* with *'āwôn* and the verb *ḥāṭā'*. Ps. 5:5(4) asserts that God does not delight in wickedness, and Ps. 45:8(7) describes an ideal king who loves *ṣeḏeq* and hates *reša'*.

Prov. 12:3 and Eccl. 8:8 address the act-consequence nexus. Job 34:10 finds that God does not do wickedness. According to Ezk. 31:11, the people's own wickedness is the reason they are cast out. Ps. 10:15 asks that wickedness be punished. In Job 35:8 Elihu asserts that God is too sublime to be affected for either weal or woe by wickedness or righteousness.

Ps. 84:11(10) uses *reša'* as an *abstractum pro concreto* in reference to the tents of the wicked; similarly also in Ezk. 7:11, where such wickedness (i.e., the wicked themselves) is punished. According to Hos. 10:13, the Israelites have sown *reša'* and reaped *'awlâ*.

The *riš'â* passages remain within the same framework. Dt. 25:2 uses the forensic meaning. Mal. 3:15,19(4:1) uses the expression "do *riš'â*." According to Prov. 11:5, wickedness leads to the fall of the wicked person (cf. 13:6). Ezk. 18:20 insists that those who practice wickedness must themselves bear its punishment. Mal. 1:4 calls Edom the land of wickedness. According to Ezk. 5:6, Jerusalem itself is more wicked than the Gentiles. According to Dt. 9:4-5, the reason Israel has received its land is not Israel's own righteousness but the wickedness of the Canaanites. Isa. 9:17(18) says metaphorically that Yahweh's own wrath turns wickedness into a fire that ignites the thickets of the land and thus itself brings about punishment.

In Zechariah's seventh night vision (5:5-11), a woman identified as personified *riš'â* (wickedness, malice) appears in a basket, which according to the LXX reading represents the iniquity of the land *('āwôn;* MT *'ayin)*. We may leave in abeyance for now the question whether this text is saying that *riš'â* is the basis and innermost essence of sin,[13] or whether two parallel terms are simply being associated in a wholly general sense. In any event the woman is sealed up in the basket and taken to Babylon, thereby removing guilt, cleansing the community, and preparing it for the coming salvation.

The subst. *mirša'aṯ* occurs only in 2 Ch. 24:7 in reference to the ruthlessness of Queen Athaliah.

---

13. So K. Elliger, *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten II. ATD* 25 (⁷1975), 112.

V. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates the words in this group differently depending on the context. It translates the verb variously as *anomeín, asebeín, adikeín, halíschein,* or *hamartánein;* the hiphil as *elénchein* or *katadikázein.* The term *rāšāʿ* is generally rendered as *asebḗs, hamartōlós,* or *ánomos; rešaʿ* as *adikía, hamartía,* or *anomía;* and finally *rišʿâ* as *anomía* or *asébeia.*

2. *Qumran.* The root is attested 180 times in Qumran (the verb about 30 times, the adjective over 60 times, and the substantives about 90 times).

Even though the founder of the Qumran community is known as the "teacher of righteousness," the contrasting term *ršʿ* represents only a partial aspect of evil. The teacher's adversary is indeed called *hakkōhēn hārāšāʿ* (1QpHab 8:8; 9:9; 11:4; 12:2,8; 4QpIsa[c] 30:3; 4QpPs 37 4:8), *ršy* occurs only once in a catalog of vices in the dualistic section of the Community Rule alongside a whole series of sins (1QS 4:9). One assertion is that God created both the righteous and the wicked (1QH 4:38; cf. 15:17), though the context here has been sundered. The adversaries of the petitioner in the *Hodayoth* are occasionally described as *ršʿ*. He lives in the realm *(g[e]ḇûl)* of ungodliness (1QH 2:8; 3:24), and the assembly of the wicked rages against him (2:12). His adversaries torment (5:17) and dismay him (2:36). They slander him (2:10), but he feels strengthened by God (7:7) and is sure that God will condemn them (2:24) and that his judgment will distinguish between *ṣaddîq* and *rāšāʿ* (7:12; cf. CD 20:21; cf. also 1QH 14:12, with *ṭôḇ* and *rāšāʿ*) and punish their sin (14:24; cf. 1QS 8:7). The *r[e]šāʿîm* are the opponents of the covenant (4:34); they are also called the "wicked of Ephraim/Israel" (4QpNah 4:5; 4QpPs 37 2:17; 3:12). Many different texts in various contexts express the hope that they will not triumph, that rather that they along with all their wickedness will be destroyed (by God) (cf. 1QpHab 5:5; 13:4; 1QM 11:14; 17:2; 1QH 2:24; 6:30; 14:16; 17:21; 1QSb 5:25; 1Q27 1, II, 5-6; CD 19:6; 4QpPs 37 2:8; 4QPs[f] 9:6; 4Q185 1-2, II, 9; 381 50:2; 508 3, II, 5; 511 1, 6; 35:1); cf. also the formula of imprecation *ʾārûr hārāšāʿ* in 4Q286 10, II, 5.

In the War Scroll the enemies are associated with *ršʿ* in the inscriptions on the field standards (1QM 3:9; 4:3-4), and we read that the sons of light will defeat the *rišʿâ* or the *r[e]šāʿîm* (1:6,13; 14:7 par.; 15:2; 17:2,6). Thus will the age of wickedness (*qēṣ hārešaʿ/hārišʿâ;* CD 6:10,14; 15:7; 1QpHab 5:8; 4Q510 1, 7; 511 10, 3) be brought to an end in which the believers have faithfully kept the covenant (1QSa 1:3).

The qal form of the verb appears in the confession at the renewal of the covenant, a confession drawing from 1 K. 8:47 and Neh. 9:33 (1QS 1:25; cf. CD 20:29; cf. the confession of the high priest on the Day of Atonement according to Mish. *Yoma* 3:8). The hiphil form generally carries the forensic meaning of "declare guilty" (CD 1:19; 4:7 with an allusion to Dt. 25:1 and Prov. 17:15; also 1QpHab 10:5; 1QS 5:7; 1QH 7:12; 9:9; 4Q511 48-51, II, 6; 63, III, 4), though it can also refer to wicked actions (1QpHab 9:11; 1Q34 3, II, 4; 4QFlor 1-3, II, 3 in a citation from Dnl. 12:10; 4QM[f] 32:4; 4Q184 1:3; 508 3:1 par. 509 146:5). The hithpael, attested only here, is used with the same meaning (4QM[a] 8-10, I, 7 par. 1QM 14:10 [cj.]).

Ringgren

רֶשֶׁף rešep

Contents: I. 1. Etymology and Occurrences; 2. Resheph as a Deity. II. OT: 1. Personal Name; 2. Remaining Passages; 3. Early Versions.

I. 1. *Etymology and Occurrences.* The etymology of this word is uncertain.[1] The term probably involves a primary noun used as a reference to the deity of which the Samaritan vb. *ršp,* "inflame," is then a denominative.[2] A closer relationship with or derivation from roots such as *śrp, šrb,* or *rṣp* is wholly indemonstrable.[3] In Jewish Ara-

---

rešep. W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (1968; repr. Winona Lake, Ind., 1978), esp. 121; A. van den Branden, "*Rešeph* nella Bibbia," *BeO* 13 (1971) 211-26; idem, "Le dieu *Rešeph* et ses épithètes," *Parole de l'Orient* 2 (1971) 389-416; A. Caquot, "Sur quelques démons de l'AT (Reshep, Qeteb, Deber)," *Sem* 6 (1956) 53-68; D. Conrad, "Der Gott Reschef," *ZAW* 83 (1971) 157-83; A. Cooper, "*MLK 'LM: 'Eternal King' or 'King of Eternity'?" Love and Death in the Ancient Near East. FS M. H. Pope* (Guilford, Conn., 1987), 1-7, esp. 4-7; M. J. Dahood, "Ancient Semitic Deities in Syria and Palestine," in S. Moscati, ed., *Le antiche divinità semitiche. SS* 1 (1958), 65-94; idem and G. Pettinato, "Ugaritic *ršp gn* and Eblaite *rasap gunu(m)^{ki}*," *Or* 46 (1977) 230-32; J. Day, "New Light on the Mythological Background of the Allusion to Resheph in Habakkuk III 5," *VT* 29 (1979) 353-55; W. J. Fulco, *The Canaanite God Rešep. AOS* 8 (1976); H. Gese, in Gese et al., *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), esp. 141-45; B. Grdseloff, *Les débuts du culte de Reschef en Égypte* (Cairo, 1942); S. E. Loewenstamm, "רֶשֶׁף," *EMiqr,* VII, 437-41; P. Matthiae, "Note sul dio siriano *Rešef*," *OrAnt* 2 (1963) 27-43; H. de Meulenaere, "De cultus van Resjef in Egypte," *Handelingen van het eenentwintigste [21e] Vlaams Filologencongress, Leven 12.-14.4.1955* (Louvain, 1955), 129-31; H.-P. Müller, "Religionsgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu den Texten von Ebla," *ZDPV* 96 (1980) 1-19, esp. 7-10; M. J. Mulder, *Kanaänitische goden in het OT* ('s-Gravenhage, 1965), esp. 87-88; F. Pomponio, "I nomi divini nei testi di Ebla," *UF* 15 (1983) 141-56; M. H. Pope and W. Röllig, "Rešep," *WbMyth,* I, 305-6; G. Scandone Matthiae and P. Xella, "*ḪYT3W* di Biblo = *Rašap*?" *RSF* 9 (1981) 147-52; M. K. Schretter, *Alter Orient und Hellas. Fragen der Beeinflussung griechischen Gedankengutes aus altorientalischen Quellen, dargestellt an den Göttern Nergal, Rescheph, Apollon. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft. Sonderheft* 33 (Innsbruck, 1974), esp. 111-73; W. K. Simpson, "New Light on the God Reshef," *JAOS* 73 (1953) 86-89; idem, "Reshep in Egypt," *Or* 29 (1960) 63-74; R. Stadelmann, *Syrisch-palästinensische Gottheiten in Ägypten. Probleme der Ägyptologie* 5 (Leiden, 1967), esp. 47-76; H. O. Thompson, *Mekal the God of Beth-Shan* (Leiden, 1970), esp. 144-63; A. Vanel, *L'iconographie du dieu de l'orage. CahRB* 3 (1965); F. Vattioni, "Il dio Resheph," *AION* 15 (1965) 39-74; E. von Weiher, *Der babylonische Gott Nergal. AOAT* 11 (1971), esp. 90-92; P. Xella, "Le dieu Rashap à Ugarit," in A. Bahnassi, ed., *Colloque International des études ugaritiques à l'occasion du Cinquantenaire des Fouilles Archéologiques à Ras Shamra (Ugarit), Lattaquié 10-13 Oct. 1979* = Numéro special *AAAS* 29/30 (1979/1980), 145-62; Y. Yadin, "New Gleanings on Resheph from Ugarit," *Biblical and Related Studies. FS S. Iwry* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1985), 259-74; P. J. van Zijl, "Translation and Discussion of Text 1001:3-5a (RŠ. 15.134:3-5a)," *JNSL* 3 (1974) 85-93.

1. Already the opinion of *GesTh,* 1314; Caquot, 64 n. 1.

2. *HAL,* III, 1297a; cf. Schretter, 137.

3. Cf., e.g., *GesTh,* 1314; Caquot, 64 n. 1; Vattioni, 66; J. M. Sola-Solé, "La plaquette en bronze d'Ibiza," *Sem* 4 (1951/52) 29. See also Fulco, 65, who thinks it possible that *ršp* repre-

maic, *rišpā'* means "flame, lightning," and as such is related to the OT use of the word.[4] In other Semitic languages *rešep* is the designation for a widely worshiped deity (see 2 below) whose name was possibly pronounced *Rašapu* and possibly derives from an original *Rašpu.*[5] One also encounters the (Amorite) form *Rušpan.*[6]

The name would thus mean "one who burns," hence the reference to fire, lightning, flame, burning, pestilence.[7] By contrast, H. P. Müller sees a connection with the Akkadian vb. *rašābu(m)* I, "to be awe-inspiring," and *rašbu(m),* "demanding reverence," while Conrad considers it ill-advised to try to derive the etymology of *ršp* from the nature of the deity Resheph itself.[8]

2. *Resheph as a Deity.* With all his various characteristics, the god Resheph was extremely widespread throughout the Mediterranean region.[9] The name of the god *dra-sa-ap* occurs as early as the Ebla tablets and even occurs frequently in Ugaritic texts.[10] Like Hebrew, Ugaritic, for example, also attests the plural form *ršpm.*[11] This plural form may summarize the various manifestations of the deity.[12]

Moving out from the Syro-Palestinian region, however, worship of Resheph became especially widespread in Egypt, particularly from the period of Amenophis II.[13] Prior to this time, till the end of the Middle Kingdom, Resheph is attested only in isolated instances (as part of a PN).[14] Resheph also occurs in other Semitic personal names as a theophoric element. Early witnesses include written documents from Mari (e.g., *I-din-dru-ûš-pa-an* and *la-aḫ-zu-[ub/ur?]-dra-sa-ap*) and Ugarit.[15]

In Ugaritic texts *Rašap* can moreover often be read for Nergal or even be identified

sents a specialized triliteralization of a primitive Afro-Asiatic root; cf. also van den Branden, "Dieu *Rešeph,*" 294-95.

4. *WTM,* IV, 475; Loewenstamm; a different view is taken by R. Zadok, "Samaritan Notes: Arsuf = Rešep 1 Chr 7,25," *BiOr* 42 (1985) 571.

5. Gese, 141-42; Albright, 121; a different view is taken by Grdseloff, 14, who suggests a derivation of *Rešouph, Rešoph, Rešiph* from **ršōp* with *aleph prosteticum;* cf. *Aršuph* of Jaffa = Apollonia of the Greeks, and the discussion in Schretter, 112-16; Vattioni, 42-43; Zadok, *BiOr* 42 (1985) 570-71, who suggests that *rešep* represents an original *qaṭl* form.

6. W. F. Albright, "New Light on the Walls of J in the NT Age," *BASOR* 84 (1941) 12 n. 18; Pope and Röllig, 305; Zadok, *BiOr* 42 (1985) 571.

7. So Gese, 142; further Pope and Röllig, 305.

8. Müller, 10; Conrad, 180. On the Akkadian verb see *AHw,* II, 960, 961.

9. Vattioni, 41-42.

10. On Ebla see Pomponio, 145. Ugaritic references include *KTU* 1.109, 22; 1.41, 13, 16, 28-29; 1.87, 14, 17, 31; 1.39, 4, 7, 17; 1.148, 8; 1.90, 20; 1.81, 10, 11, etc. (cf. *ANET* index, 704); cf. Whitaker, 577; J. C. de Moor, "The Semitic Pantheon of Ugarit," *UF* 2 (1970) 214-15; Schretter, 117-31; Xella, 159ff.; Fulco, 36-44; Yadin.

11. *KTU* 1.91, 11; cf. also *KAI* 15, where a Phoenician inscription mentions *'rṣ ršpm,* "land of Rašap" (*KAI,* II, 23-24); also *DNSI,* I, 112; II, 1087; concerning Egypt, cf. *ANET,* 250 and n. 27.

12. J. M. Tarragon, *Le Culte à Ugarit. CahRB* 19 (1980), 108; Loewenstamm, 440; *HAL,* III, 1297a-b.

13. De Meulenaere; van den Branden, "Le dieu *Rešeph,*" 390; Thompson, 144ff.; Fulco, 1-32; Stadelmann, 56-76, 134ff.

14. Fulco, 30; Loewenstamm, 439.

15. *APNM,* 263, 192; Vattioni, 43-54.

with him.[16] The theophoric element Resheph also occurs in Phoenician and Punic names.[17] Inscriptions from the fourth century B.C.E. with the element Resheph in personal names have also been found on Cyprus (Idalion, Kition).[18] Within the Aramaic linguistic sphere, one of the first inscriptions to mention Resheph is the Hadad statue of Panammuwa I of Sam'al from the mid-eighth century B.C.E.[19] After Hadad and El, Resheph ranks as the third god in the pantheon, suggesting that this deity occupied an extremely high position.[20]

Often, especially since the eighth century B.C.E., Resheph occurs together with epithets or "manifestations."[21] Examples include *Ršp-ṣprm* on the Phoenician-Hittite bilingual inscription from Karatepe, *ršp gn* in Ugarit, *bʿl ḥẓ ršp,* and *ršp mlk.*[22] One text even mentions Resheph as the gatekeeper of the sun god *Špš (ʿrbt špš ṯǵrh ršp).*[23] The reference may be to the eclipse of March 5, 1223 B.C.E.,[24] in which case Resheph is to be understood as Mars (Nergal).

Resheph emerges quite clearly in the Egyptian texts and iconography as a god with various characteristics.[25] Egyptian iconography generally portrays Resheph as a warrior with a short kilt and tassels and with the crown of Upper Egypt on his head, often bearing an emblem in the form of the head of a gazelle. Sometimes other (Asiatic) gods accompany him such as ʿAnat, Astarte, Šulman, or Ḥoron, or he appears in a triad with Min and Qudšu.[26] Albright and Dahood emphasize the polar aspects of the deity (e.g.,

---

16. Albright, 121; *PNU,* 181-82; Fulco, 34; F. B. Knutson, *RSP,* III, 486.
17. Benz, 411-12; *DNSI,* II, 1087.
18. Fulco, 36.
19. *KAI* 214.2; l. 11: *ʾrqršp.*
20. Fulco, 45; concerning other inscriptions, cf. also Schretter, 141-73.
21. Vattioni, 45-50; Xella, 152. On the date see Van den Branden, "Dieu *Rešeph,*" 392.
22. On Karatepe see *KAI* 26A.II.10-11,12 (*ANET,* 654a); cf. Caquot, 55-56: "Resheph of the birds"; M. J. Dahood, "Karatepe Notes," *Bibl* 44 (1963) 70-71:"Reshep of the he-goats"; Vattioni, 55-56; Fulco, 46; Pope and Röllig, 305. On *ršp gn* see *KTU* 4.219, 3; cf. Yadin, 264; Vattioni, 45-46; Dahood, 84: "Rešep of the garden"; S. Iwry, "New Evidence for Belomancy in Ancient Palestine and Phoenicia," *JAOS* 81 (1961) 31: "Resheph of the shield"; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Die Keilalphabetische Krugaufschrift RS 25.318," *Ugaritica* VII (1978) 147-48, 177-78: "the protecting Resheph"; Dahood and Pettinato: "Resheph of Gunu"; cf. Xella, 152; Yadin, 264-66. On *bʿl ḥẓ ršp* see *KTU* 1.82, 3; Vattioni, 46-47; Iwry, *JAOS* 81 (1961) 27-34: "Resheph of happiness"; Albright, 121; van Zijl (87) associates Resheph with rain: "the cloud of Baal is the arrow of Rešep"; Loewenstamm, 440; Xella, 148 and n. 19: "Resheph, master of the arrow." On *ršp mlk* see A. Herdner, "Nouveau textes alphabétiques de Ras Shamra," *Ugaritica* VII (1978) 15: "Resheph the king"; cf. the other epithets, e.g., in Conrad, 179.
23. *KTU* 1.78 = *TUAT,* II/1, 99-100.
24. T. de Jong and W. van Soldt, *Nature* 338 (1989) 238ff.; a different view is taken by J. F. A. Sawyer and F. R. Stephenson, "Literary and Astronomical Evidence for a Total Eclipse of the Sun Observed in Ancient Ugarit on 3 May 1378 B.C.," *BSOAS* 33 (1970) 467-89, who date this eclipse on May 3, 1375 B.C.E.; M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Sonnenfinsternis in Ugarit," *UF* 6 (1974) 464; Xella, 150.
25. Conrad, 180; Loewenstamm, 439.
26. On accompanying gods see Fulco, 65-67; Pope and Röllig, 306. On Min and Qudšu see Stadelmann, 47.

Resheph-Šulman).[27] Particularly during the period of Amenophis II in Egypt, Resheph as a war god resembles gods such as Montu or Seth.[28] According to a text composed in the Sumerian-Akkadian language, in Ugarit he was identified with the Mesopotamian god of pestilence and the underworld, Nergal.[29] Like Nergal, so also Resheph sends sickness and death, as we read in the difficult beginning to the Keret text: *mḫmšt yìtsp ršp*, "One-fifth Resheph gathered unto himself."[30] Later as well, for example in Homer's *Iliad* (1.43-53), the god Apollo ("like the night") is the one who brings pestilence with his arrows and as such can be equated with Resheph.[31] Resheph is indeed expressly identified with Apollo in a Greek-Phoenician bilingual text from ancient Tamassos (Cyprus) dating to 363 B.C.E.[32] Yet another bilingual witness (from Idalion, also on Cyprus) attests *ršp mkl*, called "Apollo of Amyklai" in Greek.[33] An Egyptian stela found in Beth-shan (Israel) in 1927 was dedicated to the god Mekal, who was hitherto unknown and who has in the meantime been identified with Resheph.[34] One must add, however, that the etymology of the god *mkl* is unclear.[35] The god *ršp* was also familiar in Carthage, where the cult of Apollo was also of considerable importance.[36]

Even if Resheph sends pestilence and plague, for example, through the heat of the sun, he was nonetheless considered to be a helper and deliverer from the very disasters that he sent, something that emerges, for instance, from the mention of this god in Ugaritic lists of gods and sacrifices. These characteristics make him on the one hand into a salvific god, and on the other into a god of the underworld and of disaster.[37] Conrad even emphasizes the character of Resheph as god of the heavens and of the weather who bestows fertility, though Xella contests this view.[38] Although he would thus be an example of a local "highest god" who takes precedence over all other powers and numina,[39] his character as a god of the underworld and of pestilence should not be underestimated.

---

27. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, [5]1968), 77-78; Dahood, 84-85; cf. Fulco, 24-28; van Zijl, 88.

28. Fulco, 31, 68-69; Stadelmann, 47.

29. E. F. Weidner, "Neue Entdeckungen in Ugarit," *AfO* 18 (1957/58) 170; Dahood, 84; J. Nougayrol, "Panthéon d'Ugarit," *Ugaritica* VII (1968) 42-64; J. Gray, "Canaanite Religion and OT Study," *Ugaritica* VII (1978) 91; Conrad, 158-69; Vattioni, 54-55; Schretter, 111; Xella, 147-48; von Weiher.

30. *KTU* 1.14, I, 18-19; *ANET*, 143a, l. 18 ("pestilence"); but cf. Conrad, 158-59; Fulco, 37 n. 188.

31. Schretter; Loewenstamm, 440; Fulco, 50-51; H. F. J. Horstmanshoff, *De pijlen van de pest; pestilenties in de griekse wereld 800-400 v.c.* (Amsterdam, 1989), esp. 24-94.

32. *KAI* 41; Vattioni, 58-61; Schretter, 155-73; Fulco, 52.

33. *KAI* 393.

34. Thompson; *ANEP*, no. 487; *ANET*, 249b.

35. Stadelmann, 53; Fulco, 53-54, who identifies *mkl* as a localized epithet, e.g., for Seth; Conrad, 176, suggests that *mkl* means "the [al]mighty."

36. *CIS* I, 251; 2628.

37. Stadelmann, 55; Fulco, 40.

38. Xella, 153.

39. Conrad, 183; cf. also van Zijl, 88.

II. OT.

1. *Personal Name.* Only in 1 Ch. 7:25 does *rešep* occur as a personal name, in this case for one of Ephraim's sons. This text is corrupt, however, and scholars often suggest reading the name *wᵉšûṯelaḥ* instead of *wᵉrešep wᵉṯelaḥ.*[40]

2. *Remaining Passages.* Apart from 1 Ch. 7:25, *rešep* occurs 7 times in the OT (Dt. 32:24; Job 5:7; Ps. 76:4[Eng. 3][pl.]; 78:48[pl.]; Cant. 8:6[bis pl.]; Hab. 3:5) and also in Hebrew Sirach (43:[14?],17c). As attested by the early versions (see 3 below), it is difficult to translate the word appropriately in every instance. In the OT *rešep* represents only a weakened form of the old god, a form that over the course of Hebrew linguistic history passes through certain stages even though the original, personal character of the god can still play a role in these nuanced meanings.[41] In Hab. 3:3ff. Yahweh advances in a theophany from the south; his coming is described in mythical language recalling the Canaanite myth of Baʿal's struggle with the sea: "Before him went pestilence, and *rešep* followed close behind" (v. 5).[42] This word is generally translated "epidemic" or "plague." Day recalls the Ugaritic text that mentions Baʿal's victory over the dragon and in which Resheph plays the role of an assistant to the deity.[43] The word *rešep* evokes not only the demonic character of such plagues, but also the personified form of epidemics *(yaṣāʾ lᵉraglāyw).*[44] Ps. 78:48 recalls the seventh Egyptian plague (Ex. 9:25) and how God "gave over their cattle to the hail, and their flocks to *rešep*." Often citing the translation of Symmachus, many interpreters view the word *bārāḏ* in this context as a scribal error from v. 47 for *deḇer.*[45] By contrast, Xella sees in *bārāḏ* an ancient Syro-Palestinian deity who has been integrated into the pantheon of Yahweh.[46] The parallelism between *deḇer* and *rešep* shows that here too the meaning of the latter is "pestilence, epidemic," a meaning that also fits well in Dt. 32:24. In the Song of Moses those who have provoked God's wrath are threatened with various plagues, including hunger, being devoured by *rešep,* and bitter pestilence. Here *rešep* is joined by *qeṭeḇ* (appearing in Ps. 91:6 alongside *deḇer;* Isa. 28:2; Hos. 13:14), whom Caquot suggests is also a (winged) demon of pestilence and destruction.[47] Ps. 76:4(3) mentions the *rišpê-qešeṯ* that Yahweh breaks in his dwelling place on Zion, followed by the "shield, the sword, and the weapons of war." Interpreters generally translate this ex-

---

40. *IPN,* 257b; J. Goettsberger, *Die Bücher der Chronik oder Paralipomenon. HS* IV/1 (1939), 81; W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 72; *BHS.*

41. See Conrad, 180; Caquot, 63ff.; Mulder, 88. On the personal character see Loewenstamm, 440-41.

42. Cf. Gilg. XI, 99-100; *ANET,* 94a, ll. 96ff.

43. Day, 353-54. See *KTU* 1.82, 1-3.

44. J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 (^{2}1977), 46.

45. Fulco, 59; Schretter, 133; S. E. Loewenstamm, "An Observation on Source-Criticism of the Plague Pericope (Ex. vii-xi)," *VT* 24 (1974) 377; *BHS.*

46. P. Xella, "'Le grand Froid': Le dieu Baradu madu à Ebla," *UF* 18 (1986) 443; cf. A. Cooper and M. H. Pope, *RSP,* III, 414-15.

47. Caquot, 59; cf. Vattioni, 67-68; *HAL,* III, 1091-92; cf. *KBL²,* 834: "thorn, barb," "measles"?

pression as "(flashing) arrows of the bow."[48] As already discussed above (I.2), Resheph also exhibited characteristics of a god of war, especially in Egypt, and in Cyprus as late as the fourth century.[49] Caquot believes that the Israelites understood Resheph as a deity associated with the atmosphere or lightning, similar to Baʿal or Hadad. Although Dahood's suggestion is difficult to demonstrate, it nonetheless deserves attention, namely, that the "arrow that flies by day" in Ps. 91:5-6, alongside *deḇer* and *qeṭeḇ,* may refer to *rešep,* possibly recalling one of the epithets of the god Resheph (cf. *ḥẓ ršp* in the Ugaritic texts[50]) and emphasizing the "fiery" aspect of the word in Hebrew.

The same nuance appears in Cant. 8:6, which compares love with death and passion with the realm of the dead. The ardor of passion is like Resheph's "fieriness," whose flashing arrows ignite an irresistible fire. No one can resist the power of love. Here Resheph's fire parallels Yahweh's own flames in that love is like a divine or demonic fate one cannot escape (Resheph as a "mythological metonymy"[51]).

In Job 5:6-7, too, one senses the element of fate inhering in *rešep:* "For misery does not come from the earth, nor does trouble sprout from the ground; but human beings are born to trouble just as the sons of *rešep* fly upward." Caquot suggests that the reference is to some sort of winged demons that fly in the heavens and bring suffering to human beings.[52] The identity of these *bᵉnê rešep,* however, is disputed.[53] F. Horst emphasizes Resheph's special relationship with birds and accordingly translates "young eagles" (cf. the discussion of the early versions below).[54] Others take the meaning "flame, fire, lightning" as their point of departure and translate "sparks (of fire)."[55] Even though the second meaning is preferable in translation, the first also fits. In these OT passages the word *rešep* still resonates with characteristics of the god Resheph who causes plagues, conducts relentless wars with his fiery arrows, and was perhaps understood as being a winged figure.[56]

Scholars have noted the development of *rešep* to the more "secular" meaning "bird (of prey)," also in Hebrew Sir. 43:17c (the mention in v. 14 is disputed because of the Greek and Latin translations), where one can translate *rešep* by "bird."[57]

3. *Early Versions.* Even though the translation of this word in the early versions is not always consistent, they do demythologize (as it were) the god Resheph by never men-

---

48. M. Dahood, *Psalms II: 51–100. AB* 17 (1968), 217-18: "with his thunderbolts."

49. Schretter, 138.

50. See I.2 above; Fulco, 59.

51. Caquot, 63.

52. Caquot, 60.

53. B. Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob. KHC* XVI (1897), 32; Pope and Röllig, 305.

54. F. Horst, *Hiob. BK* XVI/1 (³1968), 59, 81-82; cf. G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1952), 18-19.

55. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 128, 132, 148-49; so also *GesB,* 776; *LexHebAram,* 791; cf. NRSV "sparks."

56. Loewenstamm, 440-41; Schretter, 141.

57. On v. 14 cf. Vattioni, 70-71; and Y. Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem, 1965), 33, 44, who conjectures עיט *ʿyṭ* here. Cf. also *WTM,* IV, 475.

tioning him by name.[58] They often present him as a winged demon. In Ps. 76(75):4 the LXX renders the word *rešep* as *krátos,* and in 78(77):48 as *pýr.* In Job 5:7 the *b^enê rešep* are translated as *neossoí dé gypós,* "young vultures." In Cant. 8:6 the LXX renders the plural as *pepíptera pyrós,* "that which flies around the fire," i.e., "sparks,"[59] and in Dt. 32:24 as *(brṓsei) ornéōn,* "birds." In Hab. 3:5 the LXX construes *deḇer* as *dāḇār (lógos)* and translates *rešep* as *en pedílois,* "(his feet are) in sandals."[60] Jerome also often thinks of birds and translates as *volatilia* (Ps. 76:4[3]), *volucribus* (Ps. 78:48), *avis* (Job 5:7; Dt. 32:24[pl.]); he then translates Cant. 8:6 as *lampades,*[61] and Hab. 3:5 even as *diabolus.* The Pesh. more or less follows the translation of the LXX in Ps. 76:4(3) ("arms" [of the bow]) and 78:48 ("fire"). In Job 5:7, too, it thinks of birds, but then in Cant. 8:6 of the "rays" of a fire. In Hab. 3:5 the Pesh. translates *rešep* by "birds of prey," then paraphrases the MT in Dt. 32:24 with the translation "I will deliver them to the evil spirits." The Tgs. also translate the word *rešep* in different ways. In Sir. 43:14 and 17(18), the LXX is (presumably) translating *rešep* with the word *peteiná.*

Mulder†

---

58. Caquot, 57.
59. Loewenstamm, 438.
60. Cf. also H. S. J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (London, 1923), 53-54, who sees a connection between Perseus and Resheph.
61. Caquot, 63 n. 1.

רֶשֶׁת *rešeṯ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. 1. Word Field; 2. Actual Nets. III. OT. IV. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* In the surrounding culture, *rešeṯ,* "net," is attested once in Ugaritic as *rṯt* in the Baʿal-ʿAnat cycle.[1] The word occurs otherwise only in Aramaic.[2]

---

rešeṯ. P. Bird, "*YRŠ* and the Deuteronomic Theology of the Conquest" (diss., Harvard, 1971); G. Dalman, *AuS* VI (1939), esp. 314-70; K. Galling, "Jagd," *BRL*², 150-52; G. Gerleman, *Contributions to the OT Terminology of the Chase* (Lund, 1946); O. Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans., New York, 1978); A. Salonen, *Jagd und Jagdtiere im alten Mesopotamien. AnAcScFen B* 196 (1976); → צוד *ṣwd,* XII, 270-75.

1. Cf. *KTU* 1.4, II, 32; *ANET,* 132b; *UT,* no. 2361; *WUS,* no. 1248.
2. Jastrow, 1502.

Whereas *rešeṯ* has generally been derived from the Semitic root *yrš* (**wrṯ*, Akk. *erēšu* II[3]), this view has more recently been questioned. Following P. Bird, N. Lohfink has exhaustively discussed the derivation of the root → ירשׁ *yrš*, concluding that "it is dubious whether *rešeṯ* . . . derive[s] from **wrṯ* at all."[4] Instead he suggests the root *rṯy*, also attested in Ugaritic and associated with Akk. *rašû* I.[5] In all likelihood, however, *rešeṯ* represents a primary noun.[6]

2. *Occurrences.* The overwhelming number of occurrences dates to the exilic-postexilic period or, as with the Psalms, cannot be dated precisely. The term *rešeṯ* occurs 22 times in the OT, including 1 in Job, 8 in the Psalms, 2 in Proverbs, 1 in Lamentations, 4 in Ezekiel, 2 in Hosea, and also in Hebrew Sirach fr. A, Sir. 9:13-14.

II. 1. *Word Field.* As a hunting instrument, the *rešeṯ* belongs to a larger word field with whose individual terms it is often paralleled. To a certain extent, distinguishing between the various trapping devices is difficult. Parallels to *rešeṯ* include → פַּח *paḥ*, "snare" or "trap" (Hos. 5:1), *mᵉṣû(ô)ḏâ* (Ezk. 12:13; 17:20), *śᵉḇāḵâ* (Job 18:8), *ḥērem*, "dragnet" for catching fish (Ezk. 32:3). Other designations for "net" include *qēneṣ* (Job 18:2),[7] *malkōḏeṯ* (Job 18:10), and *miḵmereṯ* (Isa. 19:8; Hab. 1:15-16).

2. *Actual Nets.* Since *rešeṯ* is used only metaphorically, its background in actual hunting practice is difficult to reconstruct. The net designated by *rešeṯ* was made of flax[8] and used to catch both birds (Prov. 1:17; Hos. 7:12) and wild animals (lions, e.g., Ezk. 19:8; 32:3). In the first instance the hunter pulled the net shut when the bird flew in; in the second, hunters drove animals into a vertically positioned net.[9] It also seems to have been customary to set up a camouflaged net on the ground[10] to catch various smaller animals and into which even human beings might stumble (Job 18:8; Ps. 9:16[15]; 25:15; 31:5[4] 57:7[6]; Lam. 1:13). By contrast, fish are never caught with this kind of net.

Both Ex. 27:4-5 and 38:4 deviate completely from this context. These chapters describe the plans for constructing an altar of burnt offering as well as its execution. According to P (and Pˢ, 38:4), whose description draws from the altar in the forecourt of the Jerusalem temple,[11] the altar, which was made of wood(!) and overlaid with bronze, was to be surrounded by a bronze network or lattice *(maʿᵃśēh rešeṯ nᵉḥōšeṯ)* halfway down on which four rings were attached for the carrying poles. This description is based on the priestly guidelines deriving from a projection back into the period of the

3. Cf. *AHw,* I, 239-40; *GesB,* 776; *KBL²,* 912; but also *WUS,* no. 1248.
4. → VI, 379; similarly Bird, 64-66.
5. *UT,* no. 2363; *AHw,* II, 961-62.
6. *HAL,* III, 1298b.
7. Cf. *GesB,* 718; according to *KBL²,* 844: *qēṣ.*
8. W. Guglielmi, *LexÄg,* IV, 464.
9. Cf. Dalman, 323-24, 335-36; ill. 63; L. Trümpelmann, *RLA,* V, 236-38 with extensive bibliog.; Keel, ill. 111.
10. → פרשׂ *prś,* XII, 121-23.
11. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 278.

wilderness wanderings, which is why the altar now must be transportable. Such latticework has not yet been found on any altar remains.[12]

III. OT. The OT uses the motif of hunting with nets primarily in comparisons with human actions. In a Yahweh discourse, Hos. 5:1 accuses the priests and authorities of leading Israel into ruin. Through their reprobate (cultic?[13]) behavior, they have become a snare *(paḥ),* a net, and a pit (*šaḥaṯ,* emended text) for their people. Ezk. 19:8 describes the Babylonians' capture of Jehoiakim. Here the net symbolizes unlimited sovereignty and power.[14] Prov. 1:17 and 29:5 emphasize the particular degree of deceit involved in setting or spreading out such nets. The deceitful malice inhering in such actions prompts petitioners in the psalms of lament and trust to invoke this imagery. Petitioners compare the actions of their adversaries with the setting of nets to ensnare them (Ps. 10:9; 35:7; 57:7[6]; 140:6). Such nets became synonymous with "distress and danger."[15] In the face of such inescapable snares, the petitioner turns to Yahweh for help, anticipated as requital. Those who set such nets are themselves to become ensnared in them (Job 18:8; Ps. 9:16[15]; 25:15; 31:5[4]; 35:8). Such hopes are based on the notion of the "fateful deed" that turns directly back upon its perpetrator.[16] At the same time, Yahweh is summoned as the guarantor of the just world order to insure the validity of the act-consequence nexus. Here Yahweh's righteous aid is effected in the form of a hidden "immanent nemesis."[17]

In other passages Yahweh is himself portrayed as a hunter with a net. In a Yahweh discourse, Ezk. 12:13 and 17:20 describe the capture of Zedekiah, allegedly by Yahweh, who has himself spread the net. Ezk. 32:3 compares Pharaoh to a lion and crocodile who meet the same fate. Yahweh's skill with the net expresses his sovereignty as world ruler (cf. also EnEl IV, 41, 95). In Lam. 1:13 the city of Jerusalem laments its fate and traces it back explicitly to Yahweh's actions,[18] who spread a net for the city and brought it down. With the exception of Ezk. 32:3, all these passages deal with the fall of Judah and Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E. by ascribing the catastrophe to Yahweh himself in order to deal theologically with the crisis. This net imagery, which emphasizes the element of inescapability and the helplessness of the "victim," is prefigured in Hos. 7:12, an oracle of woe prompted by the continually vacillating foreign policy of Israel under Pekah and Hoshea.

IV. 1. *LXX.* The LXX offers different translations for *rešeṯ*. In Ex. 27:4 and 38:24 (=38:4), it circumscribes the noun adjectivally with *diktyōtós*. It does not translate *rešeṯ*

---

12. Cf. V. Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt. WMANT* 47 (1977), 147, who considers the repetition of *rešeṯ* in 27:5b as secondary (121-22); additional bibliog. in A. Reichert, *BRL*², 9-10.
13. So J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* 24/1 (1983), 75.
14. Keel, ill. 110; *ANEP,* nos. 298, 307.
15. Gerlemann, 88.
16. F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (⁴1983), 270.
17. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), 393 on Ps. 35:8.
18. Cf. H. J. Boecker, *Klagelieder. ZBK* 21 (1985), 33.

at all in Ex. 27:5, as also in Ps. 9:30(29) (= 10:9). Otherwise the LXX uses *pagís,* which generally renders Heb. *paḥ,* only in the Psalms, translating all other occurrences as *díktuon,* the familiar NT word for fishnet (cf. Mt. 4:20-21; Mk. 1:18-19; Lk. 5:2-6; Jn. 21:6,8,11).

2. *Qumran.* Drawing on the motif of the adversary in the psalms of lament, 1QH 2:29 attests the validity of the act-consequence nexus in the Qumran community. The term *rešeṯ* also presumably occurs in 1QH fr. 45:4. The text of 4Q381 31, 1 is corrupt.

Mommer

שָׂבַע *śāḇa'*; שָׂבֵעַ *śāḇēa'*; שָׂבָע *śāḇā'*; שֹׂבַע *śōḇa'*; שִׂבְעָה/שָׂבְעָה *śoḇ'â/śiḇ'â*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. Verb: 1. Qal: a. Proverbs; b. Psalms; c. Deuteronomy; d. Jeremiah, Job, Ecclesiastes; e. Remaining Books; 2. Hiphil; 3. Niphal and Piel. IV. *śāḇēa'.* V. *śāḇā'.* VI. *śōḇa'.* VII. *śoḇ'â/śiḇ'â.* VIII. 1. Sirach; 2. Qumran; 3. LXX.

I. Etymology. The root *śb'* is a Common Semitic root with the basic meaning "be/become sated/full." It occurs with this meaning in Ebla in personal names *(áš-ba-il),* also in Ugaritic *(šb'),* Akkadian *(šebû),* Old Aramaic, Imperial Aramaic, Palmyrene, and Phoenician, Jewish Aramaic *(s^eḇa'),* Syriac *(s^eba'),* Mandaic *(sba),* Old South Arabic *(s²b'),* Arabic *(šabi'a),* and Ethiopic *(ṣagba).*[1] Middle Hebrew also attests *śāḇa',* "be sated"; hiphil, "cause to become sated."[2]

In the Karatepe inscriptions *šb'* occurs in the expressions *šb' wmn'm,* "satiation and well-being," and *šb' wtrš,* "abundant nourishment and wine"[3] (concerning the varying translation of *šb',* one can adduce the semantic distinctions between Heb. *śōḇa'* and *śāḇa'*); Prov. 3:10 is often adduced when determining the meaning of *šb' wtrš.*[4] Reference to the translation of Prov. 3:10 in the LXX with the terms *sítos* and *oínos* to sup-

---

śāḇa'. G. Gerleman, "שׂבע *śb'* to be sated," *TLOT,* III, 1266-67; J. Kottsieper, "Zur Etymologie von hebr. *šb'* I," *UF* 22 (1990) 149-68.

1. For Ebla see H. P. Müller, "Das eblaitische Verbalsystem nach den bisher veröffentlichen Personennamen," in L. Cagni, ed., *La Lingua di Ebla. Atti del convegno internazionale (Napoli, 21-23 aprile 1980)* (Naples, 1981), 226; for Ugaritic, *UT,* no. 2380; for Akkadian, *AHw,* III, 1207; for Phoenician, *DNSI,* II, 1102-3; see VIII below; for Jewish Aramaic, *ANH,* 410, 282; for Syriac, *LexSyr,* 456; for Mandaic, *MdD,* 316; for Old South Arabic, Beeston, 131; for Arabic, Wehr, 452; for Ethiopic, W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic)* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 549-50; cf. *VG,* I, 169, 239.

2. *WTM,* IV, 501; concerning Qumran, see VIII below.

3. *KAI* 26A.I.6; II.7,13,16; III.7,9.

4. Cf. F. Bron, *Recherches sur les inscriptions phéniciennes de Karatepe* (Geneva, 1979), 44, 107; J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique 1974," *Syr* 51 (1974) 320, no. 107.

port the translation of *šb'* as "grain" fails to consider the various aspects of the meaning of Heb. *śāḇā'* that the LXX itself did indeed note. It translates *śāḇā'* with the expression *plēsmonḗs sítou,* thus bringing to expression both basic aspects of the meaning, that of abundance and that of foodstuffs (in the par. v. 10b, it is the verb that expresses the element of abundance).

The Sefire witnesses apply *šb'* (vb.) to children and young animals that suckle and "will not be sated."[5]

II. Occurrences. The root *śb'* occurs 97 times in the OT as the vb. *śāḇa',* 10 times as the adj. *śāḇēa',* as the substs. *śāḇā'* (8 times), *śōḇa'* (8 times), and *śoḇ'â* (6 times) or *śiḇ'â* (once). Of these 130 occurrences, 25 are in the Psalms, 22 in Proverbs, and 9 each in Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Job.

III. Verb. The vb. *śāḇa'* occurs 78 times in the qal ("be/become sated"; 18 times in Proverbs, 14 in the Psalms, 7 in Deuteronomy), once in the niphal ("become sated, full"; Job 31:31: *niśbā'*), twice in the piel ("cause to be sated, satisfied"; Ps. 90:14; Ezk. 7:19), and 16 times in the hiphil ("satisfy").

1. *Qal.* In half the occurrences the qal is used absolutely; in the remaining passages directly indicating what it is that sates, the accusative object is generally used (as a verb of fullness or of lack, *śāḇa'* can govern a direct object), less frequently a preposition (*min,* 7 times: Job 19:22; Ps. 104:13; Prov. 1:31; 14:14; 18:20; Eccl. 6:3; Isa. 66:11; *bᵉ* 3 times: Ps. 65:5[Eng. 4]; 88:4[3]; Lam. 3:30; with objects governed by prepositions, *śāḇa'* is used exclusively in a figurative sense and largely with an abstract object, especially in wisdom texts). Once (Eccl. 1:8), the verb is used with an infinitive with *lᵉ*. Most frequently, however, the verb is used in its concrete meaning "satisfy oneself, become sated," as an expression of satisfying hunger (the vb. → אכל *'kl,* "eat," generally precedes it contextually). In such cases it is generally used absolutely. When an object is mentioned, it is usually → לחם *leḥem* (Ex. 16:12; Prov. 12:11; 20:13; 28:19; 30:22; Jer. 44:17; honey in Prov. 25:16). Contextually *śāḇa'* can refer to broader enumerations (Dt. 8:10,12; 11:15; Joel 2:19; also individual foodstuffs or *leḥem,* Lev. 26:26; Ruth 2:14; Ps. 78:29; Prov. 30:9; Isa. 44:16; in a comparison in Ps. 63:6[5]).

Metaphorical use is then quite varied and broad. Here *śāḇa'* can refer to material goods (e.g., money, Eccl. 5:9[10]), sexual behavior (e.g., prostitution, Ezk. 16:28-29), experiences generally associated with an abstraction (e.g., contempt, Ps. 123:3-4), individual sufferings (e.g., 88:4[3]), or to the religious sphere (e.g., 63:6[5]).

The vb. *śāḇa'* takes on a special meaning when used to mean "be sated" in the sense of "be full of something, sick of something, reject something," in both the concrete and the figurative sense (Prov. 25:16-17; Isa. 1:11).

Although no semantic development is discernible in the OT, the word does occur more frequently and is used with more semantic variety in later texts. As far as individ-

5. *KAI* 222A.22-23; 223A.1.

ual books are concerned, the qal occurs most frequently in Proverbs, Psalms (with regard to all verbal occurrences or all occurrences of the root, the Psalms actually head the list), and Deuteronomy.

a. *Proverbs.* The frequent and varied use of *śāḇa'* in Proverbs prompts us to examine this corpus first. Here the concrete meaning "become sated" in connection with "eating" occurs in Prov. 12:11; 20:13; 28:19; 30:22 (everywhere in connection with *leḥem*); 30:9 (*leḥem* in the immediate context in v. 8; cf. IV below). A juxtaposition between 12:11 ("Those who till their land will be sated with [NRSV 'have plenty of'] bread, but those who follow worthless pursuits have no sense") and 30:22 (vv. 21-22: "Under three things the earth trembles: . . . a fool when glutted with bread [NRSV 'food']") shows that becoming sated or full could be viewed in quite different ways. Being sated or having plenty is the proper due and is viewed positively with regard to those who live appropriately, while it is quite inappropriate for the fool. Hence 30:22 is probably not to be understood psychologically in the sense of "the capriciousness of the glutton who in arrogance and boredom is prompted to act in harmful ways; because such people are unpredictable, they are dangerous and to that extent unbearable,"[6] but rather as an assessment of inappropriate events.

Prov. 5:10 uses *śāḇa'* in its concrete meaning but associates it now with concrete goods in the larger sense, "and strangers will take their fill of your wealth." Elsewhere (25:16,17) the concrete meaning prepares the reader for metaphorical usage (*śāḇa'* both times in the sense of "be sick and tired of something"): "If you have found honey, eat only enough for you, or else, having too much [i.e., being sated], you will vomit it. Let your foot be seldom in your neighbor's house, otherwise the neighbor will become weary of you [i.e., sated with you] and hate you." Prov. 28:19 (a variant to 12:11) combines the concrete and figurative usage in unsurpassed brevity: "Those who till their land will have plenty of food, but those who follow worthless pursuits will have plenty of poverty."

Another characteristic use of *śāḇa'* exclusively in Proverbs is its association with the act-consequence nexus. Four passages (1:31; 12:14; 14:14; 18:20; generally with *min*) use the notion of "becoming sated" or "having plenty" in reference to those who must, as it were, "taste" and "have enough" of the consequences of their actions and words. Here the figurative sense remains close to the concrete sense, as is evident in the way *'kl* can be used in parallel in the same metaphorical sense, e.g., Prov. 1:29-31: "Therefore they shall eat the fruit of their way and be sated with their own devices." In such contexts the metaphors associated with *śāḇa'* can be quite extensive (18:20: "From the fruit of the mouth one's stomach is satisfied; the yield of the lips brings satisfaction"). The particular characteristic of *śāḇa'* in these metaphors is that "becoming sated" stands at the end of the process of eating, i.e., a person consumes something completely until its full effect is felt (cf. the corresponding imagery of "fruit" and "yield"). The continuation of 18:20 in v. 21a ("Death and life are in the power of the tongue") introduces another motif in the image of eating and becoming sated with regard to the

---

6. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 365.

act-consequence nexus. Just as preserving or losing one's life depends on eating and becoming sated, so also do a person's plans and actions.

Finally, Proverbs characterizes *śāḇa'* in exemplary cases of *not* becoming sated (30:15-16): "Three things are never satisfied; four never say, 'Enough': Sheol, the barren womb, the earth ever thirsty for water, and the fire that never says, 'Enough.'" In 27:20 an example of such paradigmatic insatiability serves as an introductory parallelism: "Sheol and Abaddon are never satisfied, and human eyes are never satisfied."

b. *Psalms.* The Psalms also use the concrete meaning most frequently in connection with "eating" (17:14; 22:27[26]; 37:19; 59:16[15] [at the metaphorical level of comparison following *kakkāleḇ* in v. 15; at the semantic level the meaning of *'āḵal* and *śāḇa'* are to be understood figuratively]; 78:29). Ps. 78:29 may serve as an example. Here Yahweh provides nourishment for Israel during the wilderness wanderings: "And they ate and became sated [NRSV 'were well filled']" (here *śāḇa'* is amplified by *m*e*'ōḏ;* cf. 123:3-4). (Concerning becoming sated as a sign of Yahweh's succor, cf. also the hiphil passages of the Psalter, its occurrences in Deuteronomy, and individual passages from the prophets). In the three occurrences of *śāḇa'* in Ps. 104:13,16,28, the subjects are the earth (v. 13) and the trees (v. 16), with *śāḇa'* generally translated as "drink one's fill." "Drink one's fill," however, is generally rendered by a different verb, namely, → רוה *rwh,* with *rwh* and *śb'* normally being carefully distinguished. The extent to which *śāḇa'* can mean "drink one's fill" must be determined not just from Ps. 104:13 and 16, but also from Job 38:27 (hiphil); Prov. 30:16; Isa. 66:11; Am. 4:8.

An interpretation of the references in Prov. 30:16 and Job 38:27 to nature drinking its fill of water *(śb')* must note that the distinction between eating and drinking does not play a role here (cf., however, *rwh* in Isa. 55:10). Or this manner of speaking may have been perceived as metaphorical in any case, since the enumeration of "four things" in Prov. 30:16 (see the discussion above) is clearly using metaphorical language with regard to the other examples (Sheol, the barren womb, fire). General consensus usually assigns Ps. 104:13 to this same context, since *mipp*e*rî ma'*a*śeḵā* is understood as rain or something similar or is frequently emended in this sense, though the traditional text is certainly worth retaining, namely, "with the fruit of your work" as a reference to everything — not just rain — bestowed on the earth through God's actions.[7] In this context *śāḇa'* in v. 16 recalls v. 13 and can be understood from that perspective, yielding, of course, the notion of becoming sated through drinking. In both v. 13 and v. 16 it is characteristic of *śāḇa'* that the earth and trees, too, "become sated" through Yahweh's own actions. The same applies to *śāḇa'* in v. 28. All of creation becomes "filled with good things" when God opens up his hand.

The vb. *śāḇa'* is also used in reference to the suckling infant who is sated at the breast. Since the reference is to the overall intake of nourishment, *śāḇa'* should not be tied here too narrowly to the notion of drinking (metaphorically in Isa. 66:11; the verb is *ynq*). Strictly speaking, then, only Am. 4:8 remains with *śāḇa'* meaning "drink one's

7. See in this regard T. Booij, "Psalm 104,136," *Bibl* 70 (1989) 409-12, with a list of emendations in n. 1.

fill"; "So two or three towns wandered to one town to drink water, and were not satisfied" (just as "becoming sated" is Yahweh's gift, so also "not becoming sated" can be his punishment; see the discussion below).

The passages in the Psalms can also illuminate yet another metaphorical use of *śāḇaʿ*: its reference to "becoming filled, sated" with physical or spiritual suffering, as in Ps. 88:4(3): "For my soul is full of troubles, and my life draws near to Sheol" (the negative aspect comes to expression here not through *śāḇaʿ* itself, but through the object in the prepositional phrase *bᵉrāʿôṯ*). Just as in the concrete sphere the goal of becoming sated is life, so also *śbʿ bᵉrāʿôṯ* leads to death).

Ps. 123:3-4 addresses the problem of bearing and becoming sated with contempt and scorn (specifically amplified by *raḇ* in v. 3 and *rabbaṯ* and *dativus ethicus*[8] in v. 4).

Passages metaphorically describing a relationship with Yahweh or with the temple by the vb. *śāḇaʿ* demonstrate particularly well the breadth of usage of *śāḇaʿ* (17:15; 63:6[5]; 65:5[4]).

In 65:5(4) the interpretation of *śāḇaʿ* is closely tied to a text-critical problem (whether to read *qᵉḏōš* or *qāḏōš* [or *qōḏeš*] in the second stich: *niśbᵉʿâ bᵉṭûḇ bêṯeḵā qᵉḏōš hêḵāleḵā*). If one follows the MT and reads *qᵉḏōš,* the word stands in apposition ("we shall be satisfied with the goodness of your house, with the holiness of your temple"), though even this statement can be interpreted in different ways. B. Duhm suggests that "the 'holiness' of the temple, in apposition to טוֹב, apparently refers to the cult."[9] A different view is taken by H. Gunkel, who exclaims, "what precious goods are to be had here in the temple: grace, deliverance, blessing, forgiveness, sanctification! Those are the 'goods of your house'! And so much that one 'becomes sated' with them! Cf. Ps. 36:9-10."[10] Cf. also the context vv. 1-5. If one reads *qāḏōš* (or *qōḏeš*), the last two words yield a predicate nominative ("we shall be satisfied with the goodness of your house, holy is your temple"). H.-J. Kraus suggests that "with 'holiness' a human being cannot 'satisfy his hunger'; such a conception would contradict the OT concept of holiness. Verse 4b [MT 5b] should therefore be set apart; we should follow Gk and read קָדוֹשׁ."[11] Of course, even with this syntactical arrangement one could understand *niśbᵉʿâ bᵉṭûḇ* metaphorically. Kraus, however, interprets *niśbᵉʿâ bᵉṭûḇ bêṯeḵā* concretely as the cultic meal, going on to suggest that v. 5 is speaking about the happiness of those who enjoy Yahweh's cultic and table fellowship. (Kraus believes that Ps. 22:27[26], mentioned above in connection with the concrete use of the verb, probably refers to a cultic meal, though others point out that such worship fellowship is only being anticipated.)[12]

In Ps. 63:6(5) *śāḇaʿ* can only be interpreted metaphorically, since it is precisely the concrete object that is serving as a comparison: "My soul is satisfied as with marrow

---

8. *GK,* §119s.
9. B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen. KHC* XIV (²1922), 248.
10. H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 273.
11. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), 27.
12. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), in loc.; H. Irsigler, "Psalm 22, Endgestalt, Bedeutung und Funktion," *FzB* 60 (1988) 222.

and fat." The → דשן dešen was viewed as the best, most wonderful food; cf. also Ps. 36:9(8); Jer. 31:14. In a similar fashion → חלב ḥēleḇ symbolized the best part; cf. Gen. 45:18; Ps. 147:14.[13] The comparison with "marrow and fat" probably refers not only to the delicious quality of the foods but also to the sacrificial meal (cf. Lev. 7:23,25; Ps. 36:9[8]).[14] Interpreters view the actual process of "becoming sated" differently, for example, as "edification and devotion in temple worship" or as the vivifying power of God's nearness.[15] Jacquet understands the passage in the mystical sense, suggesting that enjoyment of such intimacy with the divine represents a possession that fills a person to the point of satisfying the soul's deepest aspirations (vv. 4a,6a), with the marrow illustrating here the "spiritual satiation" of the soul as realized by God within the intimacy of the sanctuary.[16] In the OT, however, the mediation of salvific beneficence can probably only be understood concretely, and in Ps. 63 it is God's → חסד ḥeseḏ (cf. the parallel nature of vv. 4,6) that quenches the psalmist's desire for life.[17] Such satiation comes to expression in praise of God (v. 6b).

Ps. 17:15 has received extremely varying interpretations: "As for me, I shall behold your face in righteousness; when I awake, I shall be satisfied *('eśbᵉʿâ),* beholding your likeness." Interpreters have understood it as a reference to resurrection hope, to spiritualized beholding of God's majesty at God's beneficent intervention, to becoming sated with the image of the splendor of the invisible temple dweller and in contemplation of the king of the world and ultimate lawgiver, or to the wish for a theophany.[18] Dating Ps. 17 to an extremely late period prompts the question of whether v. 15 may already refer to the Torah.

c. *Deuteronomy.* The occurrences in Deuteronomy (6:11; 8:10,12; 11:15; 14:29; 26:12; 31:20) are consistent both formally and substantively. All these passages use the direct expression *'kl wśbʿ* and all are concrete (though not to be ascribed to a single, specific stratum; 8:10 and 12 are generally assigned to early Dtr discourse, 6:10-12 to a text associated with the older system of superscriptions, and 11:15 to a late period). Substantively all these passages except 14:29 and 26:12 are speaking about the Israelites eating and becoming sated in the land God will give them, and (in the form of a realization, but more frequently as an admonition or warning) about the danger that precisely such satiety might seduce Israel into forgetting Yahweh (e.g., 6:11-12: "and when you have eaten your fill, take care that you do not forget Yahweh"). Dt. 11:13-16,

13. Concerning the possibility of deleting "fat," cf. Duhm, *Psalmen,* 244; also L. Jacquet, *Les Psaumes et le coeur de l'homme. Psaumes 42 à 100* (Gembloux, 1977), 292.

14. Gunkel, *Psalmen,* 268; Jacquet, *Psaumes 42 à 100,* 297.

15. Duhm, *Psalmen,* 244; Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* in loc.

16. Jacquet, *Psaumes 42 à 100,* 289, 297.

17. For a critique of such mystical interpretation, see Kraus, in loc.

18. In order: *KD,* in loc.; F. Baethgen, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (1897), 49; Duhm, *Psalmen,* 67-68; Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* in loc., with an excursus on additional interpretations and a discussion of J. Lindblom, "Bemerkungen zu den Psalmen I (Ps 8,17)," *ZAW* 59 (1942/43) 12, who suggests that v. 15 refers to an "experience of the divine demonstration of grace, a perception of God's goodness within earthly life." A thorough summary of all interpretations can be found in L. Jacquet, *Les Psaumes et le coeur de l'Homme. Psaumes 1 à 41* (Gembloux, 1975), 425-26.

a late text, associates God's gifts and the prospect of eating one's fill not only with a warning against apostasy, but also with the requirement "if you will only heed my commandments."

The motif of "becoming sated and forgetting Yahweh" is also found in the prophets. Hos. 13:6 is of interest with regard to Deuteronomy: "When I fed them, they were satisfied; they were satisfied, and their heart was proud; therefore they forgot me." "In the development of the accusation in vv. 4-6 there first occurs a train of thought which the Deuteronomic paraenesis repeatedly uses by appropriating the main catchwords, although in Deuteronomy it is considerably expanded and is given the form of an exhortation (Dt. 8:11-20; 6:12-19 [11:15f.]). Here we again recognize in Hosea one of the fathers of the early Deuteronomic movement."[19] The prophet is not criticizing the prospect of becoming sated, which he views positively as an expression of Yahweh's succor and steadfast love and as a sign of how well Israel is doing, but rather Israel's own reaction to it (cf., however, the promise in Joel 2:26; see the discussion below).

Dt. 14:29 (legislation regarding the tithe) and 26:12 (introduction to a prayer formula after delivering the tithe; a later text) are concerned that Israel allow the Levites, aliens, orphans, and widows in its midst to become sated. God's blessing is tied to this stipulation (in 26:15 as a request within the prayer).

d. *Jeremiah, Job, Ecclesiastes.* The group with the second highest number of occurrences encompasses Jeremiah (31:14; 44:17; 46:10; 50:10,19), Job (7:4; 19:22; 27:14), and Ecclesiastes (1:8; 4:8; 5:9; 6:3).

(1) *Jeremiah.* The passages in Jeremiah largely use the term in a concrete sense (albeit in extremely varied contexts), in a purely metaphorical sense only in 46:10 (closely associating *śb'* with *'kl;* par. *rwh:* on the day of retribution, "the sword shall devour and be sated"). Jer. 31:14 reads *'eṯ-ṭûḇî yiśbā'û* (although *ṭôḇ/ṭûḇ* with *śb'* can refer to nourishment, it generally transcends that notion, or if *śb'* is being used metaphorically, it has a different, abstract meaning; cf. Ps. 65:5[4]; 103:5; 104:28; Prov. 12:14; Eccl. 6:3; cf. Ps. 107:9; contextually Dt. 6:11; Neh. 9:25; Isa. 55:2); this statement represents a complementary element to Jer. 31:12 and 14a (par. *rwh*) and is probably meant concretely, though the eschatological perspective simultaneously transcends the concrete sphere (cf. Ps. 132:14-15). Alongside Jer. 31:14, the notion of "becoming sated" in 50:19 is also a sign of future salvific events (described with the aid of animal imagery). In 50:10, and here too in a different way, *śāḇa'* also connects the concrete notion of becoming sated with its metaphorical understanding (becoming sated with plundering and booty: "all who plunder her [Chaldea] shall be sated." In 44:17 the Judeans ascribe "becoming sated" to the beneficence of the "queen of heaven."

(2) *Job.* The book of Job uses the term concretely in 27:14 (the descendants of the wicked are punished by not having enough to eat) and metaphorically in 7:4 and 19:22. In 19:22 the expression "never satisfied with my flesh" derives "not from the imagery of greedy predatory animals that tear the flesh off the slain prey piece by piece, but

---

19. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 226.

from the common Semitic expression 'eat someone's flesh/pieces'" (Dnl. 3:8; 6:25[24]) meaning "denounce, accuse." On this view, Job's friends cannot become sated or get enough of falsely accusing him of sins and of denouncing him with these false accusations."[20] Part of Job's lament over his sufferings is that he is sated with unrest (NRSV "full of tossing") until dawn (7:4; *weśāḇaʿtî neḏuḏîm*).[21]

(3) *Ecclesiastes.* The assertion in Eccl. 1:8 that "the eye is not satisfied with seeing" understands this condition as a sign of the futility of human action, in this case that of sense perception (par. "or the ear filled with hearing"; here → מלא *mālēʾ* parallels *śbʿ;* Prov. 27:20 already articulates the observation used in assessing human life here; cf. 30:15-16). Ecclesiastes views human beings as being "never satisfied," especially with regard to their striving for wealth and money, in which their efforts are useless and futile (5:9[10]). Eccl. 4:8 combines both motifs in the assertion that "their eyes are never satisfied with riches." By contrast, Eccl. 6:3 must be understood against the background of the ideal of "old and sated with life" (see the discussion of *śāḇēaʿ* below): "A man may beget a hundred children, and live many years; but however many are the days of his years [resonance with 5:17,19], if he is not sated with [NRSV 'enjoy'] life's good things, . . . I say that a stillborn child is better off than he." Even the blessing of abundant goods is burdened by the "possibility of divine veto. Imperceptibly the idea of the full enjoyment of such goods being blocked by divine decree (v. 2) turns into the idea in 1:8 (4:8) that human desire is basically insatiable, an idea already expressed by the introductory proverb (5:9) to the present group. This insight once again throws this whole view into an incomparably darker light: Can 'satiation' or satisfaction be attained at all, even where God does allow a person's enjoyment?"[22]

e. *Remaining Books.* The vb. *śāḇaʿ* occurs only in isolated instances in the remaining OT books. Passages speaking about becoming sated in a concrete sense refer first of all to satiety as an expression of God's salvific acts toward Israel: Ex. 16:8,12 (Yahweh allows the people to become sated in the wilderness); Hos. 13:6 (see discussion above); Neh. 9:25 (in part a verbatim agreement with Dt. 6:10-11; 8:7ff.; see discussion above; the retrospective on becoming sated as a result of the land conquest recalls Yahweh's beneficence and condemns Israel's own behavior); Joel 2:19,26 (here as elsewhere, *ʾkl wśbʿ* constitutes a substantive unity; unlike Hos. 13:6 [cf. Dt. 8:7ff. and elsewhere[23]], becoming sated will eventually lead to praise of God). By contrast, "not becoming satisfied" can be part of the threat or punishment: Am. 4:8 (cf. discussion above); Hos. 4:10 ("they shall eat, but not be satisfied," in reference to greedy priests; cf. v. 8); Mic. 6:14 ("you shall eat, but not be satisfied," in reference to Jerusalemites with "dishonest weights" and "deceit in their mouths"); Lev. 26:26 ("and though you eat, you shall not be satisfied," as a conclusion to the fourth stage of in-

---

20. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 316.

21. Concerning the problems attaching to this verse, cf. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 163; J. Reider, "מְדָּד in Job 7:4," *JBL* 39 (1920) 60-65; R. Gordis, "Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental and Rabbinic Literature," *HUCA* 22 (1949) 182.

22. W. Zimmerli, *Prediger. ATD* XVI/1 ([3]1980), 193-94.

23. Cf. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 56, 64-65.

creased penalties for disobedience). Lam. 5:6 is unique in its lament over becoming sated only at the price of alliances ("We have made a pact with Egypt and Assyria, to get enough bread [*liśbōa' lāḥem*]"). No particular connotations attach to Ruth 2:14; 2 Ch. 31:10 (sign of blessing); Isa. 44:16; Ezk. 39:20 (animals becoming sated with Yahweh's enemies as one element in an historical portrayal; *śoḇ'â* [cf. discussion below] occurs in v. 19 with imagery from animal sacrifice; cf. 32:4 [hiphil], where God intends to "let the wild animals of the whole earth gorge themselves" with the great crocodile, Pharaoh).

Several passages attesting metaphorical usage express the aspect of being "insatiable": Isa. 9:19(20) ("they gorged . . . but still were hungry"; the par. to *lō' śb'* is *r'b;* concerning the text see *BHS*); Ezk. 16:28 (*śāḇa'* already metaphorically engaged at the level of the imagery itself: "you played the whore with them and still you were not satisfied"); Hab. 2:5 ("like Death, they never have enough"; here Death [par. Sheol], in a comparison, is viewed as an example of insatiability; the par. to *w^e^lō' yiśbā'* is the image "they open their throats wide").

One must examine three passages from Isaiah as a group: Isa. 1:11, "I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams" (even if this verse is using *śāḇa'* figuratively in the meaning "have enough of, be sick of," the imagery itself derives from the concrete notion of feeding the deity); 53:11;[24] 66:11 (see discussion above). The remaining passages speak about being sated with shame and scorn (Hab. 2:16, *śāḇa'tā qālôn mikkāḇôḏ;* Lam. 3:30, *yiśba' b^e^ḥerpâ*) and about being sated with life (1 Ch. 23:1; 2 Ch. 24:15; see discussion below).

2. *Hiphil.* The hiphil of *śāḇa'* occurs 16 times, in every instance in verse, and most frequently in the Psalms (81:17[16]; 91:16; 103:5; 105:40; 107:9; 132:15; 145:16; 147:14), then also in Job 9:18; 38:27; Isa. 58:10,11; Jer. 5:7; Lam. 3:15; Ezk. 27:33; 32:4. It is also characteristic that God is the subject in all but two of these passages (Isa. 58:10; Ezk. 27:33). In the Psalms God's ability to satisfy and sate is everywhere an expression of his steadfast love. God provided nourishment for Israel in its past (Ps. 105:40, "gave them food from heaven in abundance"; 107:9, "for he satisfies [*hiśbîa'*] the thirsty, and the hungry he fills [*millē'*] with good things"), is still doing so now (147:14), and intends to do so in the future (81:17[16], if Israel is obedient; 132:15, in a quoted promise Yahweh makes to Zion). Figurative usage, albeit always in reference to concrete events, also speaks of God's saving actions. The confessional praise of Ps. 145:15-16 still speaks of food in v. 15 but then expands this notion in v. 16 to that of "satisfying the desire of every living thing" through Yahweh's beneficent deeds (*rāṣôn;* cf. Dt. 33:23). The psalmist in Ps. 103:5 speaks about being satisfied with "goods," including healing and energy or renewed life. (Ps. 103:5 and 145:16 use the hiphil ptcp. of *śāḇa'* as a divine epithet.) In Ps. 91:16 Yahweh promises satiety and long life to those who cling to him, know his name, and call upon him (cf. in this regard the discussion below regarding being "sated with life").

---

24. Concerning this difficult passage from the Servant Songs, see the bibliog. → X, 376-78.

Passages outside the Psalms using *śāḇa'* hiphil can also speak concretely about becoming sated as a result of God's steadfast love for his people. In Jer. 5:7 God judges Israel because even though he has fed the children of Jerusalem "to the full," they have turned away from him (see the discussion of Hos. 13:6 above). In Isa. 58:11 God promises to satisfy Israel (in an eschatologically expanded context) only if Israel in its own turn satisfies the hungry (v. 10; cf. Dt. 14:29; 26:12). Twice the hiphil of *śāḇa'* describes how Yahweh brings unbearable suffering upon someone (Job 9:18; Lam. 3:15). (Regarding the remaining passages Job 38:27; Ezk. 27:33; 32:4, see their mention in connection with other texts.)

3. *Niphal and Piel.* The niphal occurs only in Job 31:31, which uses it concretely with reference to a festive meal.[25]

Of the two occurrences of the piel, Ps. 90:14 uses it metaphorically: "Satisfy us in the morning with your steadfast love" (see the discussion of Ps. 63:6[5] above; concerning the association of *śb'* with *ḥeseḏ* [v. 4], cf. the analogous use in Ps. 145:16: *śb'* with *rāṣôn;* also Dt. 33:23: *śᵉḇa' rāṣôn;* cf. Ps. 104:28 and 103:5 with *ṭôḇ*). Ezk. 7:19 uses *śāḇa'* concretely to mean "satisfy." This negative assertion (*napšām lō' yᵉśabbē'û,* "they shall not satisfy their hunger," par. *ûmē'êhem lō' yᵉmallē'û,* "or fill their stomachs with it") is part of a portrayal of judgment (cf. similarly Hos. 4:10; Mic. 6:14; etc.; see the discussion above).

Ezk. 7:19 is one example from a series of passages using *śb'* together with *nepeš* (in part already mentioned in a different context):[26] with *nepeš* in its basic meaning "throat, gullet" within parallelism in Hab. 2:5; with *nepeš,* "lust, desire, longing," as physical hunger in Dt. 23:25(24) ("you may eat grapes according to your desire [*kᵉnapšᵉḵā*]," the following *śoḇ'eḵā* once again qualifies [as a gloss?] the amount, namely, "your fill"[27]); Prov. 13:25. In this context, too, one can often clearly see how the notion of becoming sated transcends its elementary function and assumes significance with regard to the entire person,[28] a point evident in the confluence of the various meanings of *nepeš* in several passages (e.g., Ps. 107:9). In that "'craving, desire' designates a basic aspect of humanity" and does not "view the latter negatively from the outset,"[29] such satiation is positively assessed.

In Ps. 107:9 *nepeš* is the object of *śāḇa'* hiphil; similarly also in Isa. 58:10,11, and in Ezk. 7:19 of *śāḇa'* piel (see the discussion above).

In several instances *nepeš* is the subject of *śāḇa';* these passages involve figurative

---

25. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 440; concerning the problems attaching to the verse and the interpretation of *nśb* as a qal 1st person pl. impf., cf. B. Jongeling, "L'expression *my ytn* dans l'AT," *VT* 24 (1974) 37ff.

26. → נפשׁ *nepeš,* §§IV.1, IV.2 (IX, 504-8); C. Westermann, "נֶפֶשׁ *nepeš* soul," *TLOT,* II, 743-59.

27. Concerning the adverbial accusative, see *GK* §118m; concerning the origin of this expression as a gloss, see C. Steuernagel, *Das Deuteronomium. HKAT* I/3 (²1923), 138; concerning its assessment as "a slight restriction," see E. König, *Das Deuteronomium. KAT* III (1917), 163.

28. Concerning Prov. 27:7, → IX, 505-6; also 504.

29. Westermann, 747.

and especially metaphorical usage: Eccl. 6:3 (see the discussion above; regarding *wᵉnapšô lō'-ṯiśba' min-haṭṭôḇâ* in reference to all spheres of life, cf. v. 6; *nep̲eš* is used differently in v. 7[30]); obvious metaphorical usage in Ps. 88:4(3); 123:4 (negative sense); 63:6[5] (positive sense; see the discussions above);[31] Jer. 50:19. In other instances *śb'* is related to *nepeš* only contextually (Isa. 55:2; 56:11; Jer. 31:14; Hos. 4:8-10, everywhere in reference to hunger or eating).

IV. *śāḇēa'*. Of the 10 occurrences of *śāḇēa'* in the OT, 4 use the word to mean "sated (with life)" (3 times in the construct expression *śᵉḇa' yāmîm,* once absolutely [Gen. 25:8], variants including *śᵉḇa' yāmîm;* cf. *BHS*). The passages are late: Gen. 25:8; 35:29; 1 Ch. 29:28; Job 42:17 (the same content is expressed verbally in 1 Ch. 23:1 and 2 Ch. 24:15, two passages reflecting adjectival use; cf. also Ps. 91:16). Only a few persons are said to have become "sated with life": Abraham, Isaac, David, Job, and the priest Jehoiada. In expressing the notion of being "sated with life," *śāḇēa'* refers to satiety in a positive sense, i.e., such that an extremely aged person (*śb'* suggests the comparison: "as after a meal") says farewell from life without weariness but also without any further longing for life (or food; "שבע expresses total enjoyment, not weariness"[32]). This positive aspect is particularly evident in 1 Ch. 29:28, which is not just concerned with being sated with life: "He died in a good old age, full of days [= sated with life], riches, and honor" (cf. Ps. 91:16 with *śāḇa'* hiphil: "With long life I will satisfy them, and show them my salvation"). This positive assessment also becomes clear if contrasted with the negative character of Job 14:1: "A mortal, born of woman, few of days *(qᵉṣar yāmîm)* and full of trouble *(śᵉḇa' rōḡez).*" That is, a person becomes "sated" not through a fulfilling and long life, but through the trouble of life. According to the concluding framework in 42:17, however, Job himself "died old and full of days."

The remaining occurrences of *śāḇēa'* are all found in poetry. Three passages use the term concretely: 1 S. 2:5; Prov. 19:23; 27:7. The first two passages here attest once more how differently late texts can view the notion of becoming sated. In Prov. 19:23 "being filled" is a result of one's fear of God, and is ultimately, like protection against evil, a sign of Yahweh's goodness (concerning this positive understanding of *śb',* cf. Prov. 12:11; 28:19; 30:22; and esp. 13:25 and Ps. 37:18-19). This assessment corresponds to the general, unqualified positive assessment of concrete satiation in the OT. Criticism is directed only against any attendant false behavior such as apostasy as a result of satiety, as is the case especially among the prophets and in Deuteronomy (see the discussion above of Dt. 6:11-12; 8:10-14; 11:15-16; Neh. 9:25-26; Jer. 5:7; Hos. 13:6). Prov. 30:9 individualizes the problem and views *śb'* so critically that the passage rather should be classified in the next group, though here such satiety or gluttony really refers only to wealth.[33] "Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with the food that I need, or I shall be full, and deny you" (vv. 8-9). This view changes only in isolated

30. → IX, 508ff.; Westermann, 747-48.
31. Concerning the translation of *nepeš* in these passages, see Westermann, 748-49.
32. O. Procksch, *Die Genesis. KAT* I (³1924), 532.
33. See Plöger, *Sprüche,* 360.

late passages (1 S. 2:5; Prov. 30:22; Eccl. 5:11[12]), though Prov. 30:22 and Eccl. 5:11(12) are speaking about the satiety of a specific person (concerning Prov. 30:22, see the discussion above; Eccl. 5:11[12] [with *śāḇā'*], where the rich person assumes the role of the wicked in the contrast between "good" and "bad," characterizes such persons by the "surfeit" through which they are able to become sated [*śāḇa'*]). Although 1 S. 2:5 is indeed concerned with a reassessment in the general sense, more specifically it suggests that satiety is no longer a sign of nearness to Yahweh. (The opposite of *śāḇēa'* is *rā'ēḇ;* similarly also Prov. 27:7; Isa. 9:19[20], with a verb; cf. Gen. 41:29ff.; Ps. 37:19; 107:9). The remaining three occurrences are metaphorical: Dt. 33:23 ("Naphtali, sated with favor, full of the blessing of Yahweh" [*śᵉḇa' rāṣôn* par. *mālē' birkaṯ yhwh,* both terms expressed concretely by the following enumeration of possessions); Job 10:15 ("filled with disgrace"); 14:1 (cited above).

V. *śāḇā'*. The term *śāḇā'* cannot be understood as "fullness, superabundance" in the general sense. The word refers only to a surfeit of foodstuffs, to a wealth of means for satisfying oneself. The aspect of nourishment is not lost. Of the 8 occurrences, 6 refer to the rich yields of the seven years of "great plenty" in Egypt: Gen. 41:29,30,31, 34,47,53 (the contrast to *śāḇā'* is *rā'āḇ;* see esp. vv. 30,34). Prov. 3:10 also refers to the harvest yield (see VIII below): "Then your barns will be filled with plenty (of food), and your vats will be bursting with wine" (concerning the conditions attaching to this abundance, see v. 9). Eccl. 5:11(12), cited above, also refers to a surfeit of foodstuffs (cf. v. 11a[12a]).

VI. *śōḇa'*. The term *śōḇa'* always means "satiation." Of its 8 occurrences (Ex. 16:3; Lev. 25:19; 26:5; Dt. 23:25[24]; Ruth 2:18; Ps. 16:11; 78:25; Prov. 13:25), 7 use the term concretely and include either *'kl* or *leḥem* in the immediate context (Ruth 2:18 refers back to v. 14); only Ps. 16:11 uses *śōḇa'* metaphorically (here the meaning corresponds to "becoming full of joys" in the concrete sense). The prepositional phrase *lāśōḇa'* occurs 5 times (governed in Prov. 13:25 by the *nomen rectum*). These passages speak about satiation in contexts corresponding to those using the verb (Ps. 78:25 refers to becoming sated during the wilderness wanderings; Lev. 25:19; 26:5, in the promised land, albeit under the condition of obedience [cf. Dt. 11:15]; concerning Prov. 13:25, cf. 12:11; 28:19; 30:22; and esp. 19:23; concerning Dt. 23:25, see the discussion above).

VII. *śoḇ'â/śiḇ'â*. The terms *śoḇ'â/śiḇ'â* (Isa. 23:18; 55:2; 56:11; Ezk. 16:28,49; 39:19; Hag. 1:6) also mean "satiation" (in 4 instances *lᵉśoḇ'â,* "to the point of satiation"; because *śiḇ'â* occurs only once [Ezk. 16:49], its specific meaning can probably not be delineated; perhaps it refers to the means of satiation with the connotation "fullness, surfeit": *śiḇ'aṯ leḥem,* "excess of food" [so NRSV]). The word is used largely in a concrete sense (metaphorically only in Ezk. 16:28; in Isa. 56:11 the concrete meaning of the imagery flows into the metaphorical meaning with regard to the guards) and in direct connection with *'kl* or *leḥem* (in Isa. 55:2 *bᵉlô'-leḥem* and *bᵉlô' lᵉśoḇâ* are parallel; in 56:11 *lō' yāḏᵉ'û śoḇ'â,* "they never have enough," is qualified by the preceding *'azzê-nepeš,* "having a mighty ap-

petite"). The word occurs only in the prophets and refers everywhere to a group (in Ezk. 39:19 to animals [see the discussion above], in Isa. 56:11 within animal imagery, otherwise always to human beings). The semantic notion "satiation" involves a positive assessment. According to Isa. 23:18, those "who live in the presence of Yahweh" will have "abundant food" from the profits of Tyre (cf. Ezk. 27:33 hiphil: "When your wares came from the seas, you satisfied many peoples"). Ezk. 16:49, too, does not view *śiḇʿaṯ leḥem* negatively in and of itself, but rather one's behavior with regard to it, in this case that of Sodom. Correspondingly, insufficient satiation represents a lack or even punishment: Isa. 55:2; Hag. 1:6. At the metaphorical level as well, Isa. 56:11 and Ezk. 16:28 negatively view the notion of a lack of "satiation" in the sense of "insatiable."

VIII. 1. *Sirach.* The passages in Sirach are commensurate with the usage already discussed: 12:16 ("he will never have enough of your blood"); 37:24 ("he becomes sated with delights"); and 42:25 ("who could ever get enough of seeing his glory"; *śbʿ* with *l^e: yśbʿ lhbyṭ,* cf. Eccl. 1:8).

2. *Qumran.* The 11 occurrences (including 4Q502 40:2) of *śbʿ* in the Qumran texts correspond to the word's usage in the OT. Biblical equivalents can be adduced for 1Q22 2, 4 (cf. Dt. 6:11); 2QJub^a 1, 5 (cf. Jub. 23:8; Gen. 25:8); 4QDibHam^a 1-2, IV, 14 (cf. Dt. 31:20); 4QPs^f 9:14, "the poor shall be sated," and 4Q370 1:1. 1QpHab 3:12 interprets Hab. 1:8-9 as referring to the Romans, whose lust for conquest "cannot be satisfied." The term *śbʿ* occurs in connection with "eating" in 11QPs^a 18:11; 4QpHos^a 2:3, where Hos. 2:10 is understood as meaning that "they became satisfied and forgot God," and 4Q181 2, 3, "he satisfied Israel with plenty" *(bśbʿym hśbyʿ).*

3. *LXX.* The LXX translates the verb largely with forms of *(em)pi(m)plánai* and (less frequently) *chortázein.* It renders *śāḇēaʿ* with *plḗrēs* (5 times) or *plēsmonḗ* (twice), then *śāḇāʿ* with a verb form and as *euthēnía* (5 times) and *plēsmonḗ* (Gen. 41:30; in Prov. 3:10: *plēsmonḗs sítou;* see the discussion above), and finally translates *śōḇaʿ* and *śiḇʿâ/śoḇʿâ* either verbally or with the aid of *plēsmonḗ.*

Warmuth

שָׂבַר *śāḇar;* שֵׂבֶר *śēḇer*

Contents: I. Occurrences and Meaning in the Semitic Languages. II. Occurrences and Meaning in the OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Meaning: a. Secular Meaning; b. Theological Meaning; c. Qal and Aramaic *śbr/sbr.* III. LXX.

śāḇar. J. Heller, "Die abgeschlagene Mauer," *Communio Viatorum* 11 (1968) 175-78; E. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im AT* (Halle, 1902), esp. 85-86; Wagner, esp. 108;

I. Occurrences and Meaning in the Semitic Languages. Although there is no written or semantic equivalent within the East Semitic or Ugaritic realm for OT *śbr* (Hebrew) and *sbr* (Aramaic), the root *sbr* is widespread in the Aramaic sphere, where it is accompanied by a broad word field extending geographically and chronologically from Elephantine (5th century B.C.E.) to Palmyra (3rd century C.E.)[1] and is represented by a series of derivatives in the Tgs. and rabbinical writings.[2]

The meaning of this root extends from intellectual capacity in the sense of expertise (*sbr'*, "master workman," e.g., of stone masonry[3]) to strategic anticipation and planning ("Now behold, I thought [*sbrt*] . . . if we had appeared before Arsames"[4]) to resolute implementation (Dnl. 7:25 Aramaic: "and intends [*wᵉyisbar*] to change the sacred seasons and the law"). This context may also include the qal ptcp. *sōḇēr* (Neh. 2:13,15), "closely observe, inspect," which has been interpreted as an Aramaism.[5] By contrast, *sbr* and its derivatives in the Aramaic Tgs. refer not only to concepts such as "reason" or "acumen," which Modern Hebrew has adopted, but also a disposition of hope and goodwill.[6] Among the Qumran writings, none of the variants uses *śbr* or its derivatives.

II. Occurrences and Meaning in the OT.

1. *Occurrences.* The vb. *śbr* occurs altogether 8 times, including 6 in the piel, the remaining 2 in the qal, which corresponds to Aramaic peal (Dnl. 7:25). The term *śēḇer*, deriving from *śbr*, occurs twice.

Compared to other verbs of waiting and hoping, it is striking that *śbr* is used so infrequently[7] and never parallel to those other words. The root *śbr* apparently belongs to a more recent linguistic stage, something also suggested by its widespread use in the Aramaic sphere.[8]

2. *Meaning.* Passages using *śbr* in the piel and the derivative *śēḇer* refer to hopeful waiting, though only twice in secular contexts (a); in the majority of cases, the reference is to Yahweh (b).

a. *Secular Meaning.* Naomi asks her daughters-in-law, Orpah and Ruth, whether

---

C. Westermann, "Das Hoffen im AT," *Theologia Viatorum* 4 (1952/53) 19-70, esp. 36 = *Forschung am AT. ThB* 24 (1964), 219-65, esp. 234; W. Zimmerli, *Man and His Hope in the OT. SBT* 2/20 (Eng. trans. 1971), 5-6.

1. *DNSI*, II, 775.
2. Cf. *WTM*, III, 470ff.; also *HAL*, III, 1304-5.
3. J. Cantineau, *Inventaire des Inscriptions de Palmyre*, fasc. IX (Beirut, 1933), no. 4.2.
4. *AP* 37.7.
5. See II.2.c below.
6. See *WTM*, III, 470-72.
7. Cf. Westermann, 21; also H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1974), 149-50.
8. Cf. Westermann, 36; Zimmerli, 6.

they want to wait (synonym *'gn,* "hold oneself back") to remarry till a son Naomi herself might bear would be old enough to marry (Ruth 1:13). The book of Esther relates how the enemies of the Jewish citizens in the Persian Empire hoped *(śibbᵉrû)* to "gain power over them" and destroy them (Est. 9:1).

b. *Theological Meaning.* Hopeful waiting for Yahweh focuses on various objects. Ps. 104:27 (similarly 145:15) speaks about the food Yahweh provides for human beings and animals (cf. Mt. 6:11,25-26). All other statements anticipate Yahweh's help: Ps. 119:166 *(yᵉšû'â);* 146:5 *('ēzer* par. *śēḇer);* Ps. 119:116 associates the petitioner's hope with assured life *(somḵēnî . . . wᵉ'eḥyeh)* and negatively contrasts such hoping with "letting someone be put to shame" *(hēḇîš).* The Song of Hezekiah also focuses on deliverance from impending death, citing the frequently used argument that "those who go down to the Pit cannot hope *(lō'-yᵉśabbᵉrû)* for your faithfulness" (Isa. 38:18). Both *śbr* and *śēḇer* are apparently part of the language of the Psalms, particularly of the later period.[9]

c. *Qal and Aramaic śbr/sbr.* The qal of *śbr* occurs only in Neh. 2:13 and 15. Although interpreters often understand the term here with reference to Arab. *sabara,* "closely examine (a wound),"[10] Kautzsch points out the proximity between *śbr,* "I direct my attention to the walls" (according to LXX[L], *śbr = katanoeîn*), and Aram. *sbr* in Dnl. 7:25, "he will be intent on doing something" and the rendering of *śōḇēr* by *ḥôšēḇ* by the Jewish grammarian David Kimchi.[11] Heller reads *šbr* and believes that Nehemiah is striking off all cultic appendages from the wall remnants.[12]

III. LXX. For both the verb and the noun, the LXX uses the corresponding forms of *elpízein* (Ps. 145[144]:15; Isa. 38:18) and *elpís* (Ps. 146[145]:5) or *prosdokán* (104:27; 119:166) and *prosdokía* (119:116). In Ruth 1:13 *prosdéchesthai* corresponds to the Hebrew verb. In Neh. 2:13 and 15, the form *syntríbōn* presupposes the Hebrew vb. *šbr.*[13] The Greek text of Est. 9:1 does not correspond to the MT and thus does not offer an equivalent.

Beyse

9. See Westermann, 36.
10. *GesB,* 778; W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia samt 3. Esra. HAT* XX (1949), 110.
11. Kautzsch, 85.
12. See the debate in H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah. WBC* 16 (1985), 186.
13. Cf. Rudolph, 110; Kautzsch, 85.

שָׂגַב *śāgab̲*; מִשְׂגָּב *miśgāb̲*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. OT Use: 1. General and Concrete Use; 2. In Relation to God; Figurative Use; 3. "Security." IV. *miśgāb̲*. V. LXX. VI. Qumran.

I. Etymology. The root *śgb* appears perhaps in Akk. *sag/kbu(m), sagbû(m),* "a class of soldiers."[1] It is also attested as a Canaanite loanword in an Amarna letter, which says that a wall "raises itself" *(isku pu).*[2] In the Old Aramaic Sefire inscriptions, *śgb* occurs first in the sense of "secure, protect" (a contractual partner who does not "protect" the house and descendants of the other in war is charged with breach of contract), then also in the sense of "great, mighty person."[3] In Talmudic Aramaic, *śgb* in the pael means "make strong."[4] W. W. Müller adduces *śēgīb,* "fence," in the New South Arabic language Mehri.[5]

II. Occurrences. The verb occurs in the OT twice in the qal, 10 times in the niphal, 7 in the piel, and once each in the pual and hiphil. The noun *miśgāb̲,* "refuge," occurs 16 times (Jer. 48:1 is questionable).

III. OT Use.

1. *General and Concrete Use.* The concrete meaning of the verb is apparently "be high." Since a high fortress or a high wall offers good protection and security, *śgb* often exhibits these semantic nuances even when the context suggests the concrete meaning. Such is the case in Moses' introductory discourse in Deuteronomy, where he says that throughout the entire Transjordan, no city *(qiryâ)* was too high (qal) for the Israelites, for God gave everything into their hands (Dt. 2:36). A city on a high location or surrounded by high walls is impregnable. This meaning is less clear in Isa. 30:13 (niphal), which speaks about a high wall *(ḥômâ)* that has a break in it, "bulging out, and about to collapse," imagery intended to show how trust in false prophets (v. 12) collapses on its own initiative. The notion of a (false) sense of security may be resonating here, as is certainly the case in Prov. 18:11: "The wealth of the rich is his strong city *(qiryat̲ 'uzzô)* and is like a high (*śgb* niphal) wall in his imagination" (*b*ᵉ*maśkîṯô;* the reading *bimśukkāṯô* in LXX, Vg., and Pesh. yields no better sense: "in his fencing"?[6]).

The context in Isa. 26:5 clearly suggests the notion of "being high." The inhabitants

---

śāgab̲. P. Hugger, *Jahwe meine Zuflucht. MüSt* 13 (1971), esp. 96-81.

1. *AHw,* II, 1002; *CAD,* XV, 22-23.
2. EA 147:53.
3. *KAI* 222B.32; 224.13-14; cf. *DNSI,* II, 1109.
4. *WTM,* 454.
5. W. W. Müller, in Christian Robin, ed., *Mélanges linguistiques. FS Maxime Rodinson. GLECS Sup* 12 (1985), 275.
6. See H. Ringgren, *Sprüche–Prediger. ATD* 16/1 (³1962), 74-75.

of the height *(mārôm)* are brought down (*šḥḥ* hiphil), the lofty city *(qiryâ niśgāḇâ)* is laid low (*špl* hiphil), events underscored by the additional qualifications *'aḏ-'ereṣ,* "to the ground," and *'aḏ-'āpār,* "into the dust." One should also note, however, that v. 4 speaks of Yahweh as an "everlasting rock," i.e., as a secure refuge.[7] Job 5:11 also refers to "being high" in the figurative sense in that God "sets on high" *(śîm lᵉmārôm)* "those who are lowly" *(špl),* while "those who mourn" are lifted high to safety *(śāgᵉḇû yešaʻ).*

2. *In Relation to God; Figurative Use.* The niphal is used to refer figuratively to God or to his name as "exalted," occasionally in connection with forms of *rwm.* Isa. 33:5 says that Yahweh is *niśgāḇ* because he dwells *(škn)* "on high" *(mārôm).* Isa. 2:11 uses the contrast with *špl* to underscore this meaning: "The haughty eyes of people *('ênê gaḇhûṯ)* shall be brought low *(špl),* and the pride *(rûm)* of everyone shall be humbled *(šḥḥ);* and Yahweh alone will be exalted *(niśgāḇ).* Verse 17 repeats the same idea with the same words in different combinations.

The thanksgiving song in Isa. 12 summons to praise and thanksgiving and to a proclamation of God's deeds, "for his name is exalted *(niśgāḇ)*" (Isa. 12:4). Job 36:22 uses the hiphil with qal meaning in its assertion that "God is exalted in his power."

The idea of security and protection comes to expression in Prov. 18:10: "The name of Yahweh is a strong tower *(migdal-'ōz);* the righteous run into it and are protected *(niśgāḇ).*" It is noteworthy that v. 11 (see above) speaks about the false security of the rich.

One isolated passage uses *niśgāḇ* in reference to God's omniscience: "Such knowledge . . . is so high that I cannot attain it" (Ps. 139:6), i.e., it is inaccessible, unattainable.

3. *Security.* The nuance "security" comes to expression especially in the Psalms when someone asks God for protection (*śgb* piel). Parallel terms always qualify the idea more precisely. In 59:2(Eng. 1), the psalmist asks for deliverance *(nṣl)* from enemies and for protection against them. In 91:14 God promises to deliver *(plṭ)* and protect those who trust in him. Ps. 20:2(1) associates the wish "[may] the name of the God of Jacob protect you" with an answer to that wish on the day of distress. Ps. 69:30(29) is convinced that God's *yᵉšû'â* (salvation) will protect the lowly *('ānî)* and those in pain *(kô'ēḇ).* Ps. 107:40-41 enumerates a whole series of related and antithetical terms in telling how God will bring contempt and confusion upon the princes while raising up the needy out of their distress (*śgb* piel), whereby the idea of exaltation also resonates. According to Prov. 29:25, those who trust in God are secure (*śgb* pual), contrasted with the snare into which fear drives a person.

IV. *miśgāḇ.* Commensurate with the basic meaning of the verb, *miśgāḇ* refers to a height or high rock where one can find refuge. Hence Isa. 33:16 says that during the salvific age, the righteous "will live on the heights *(mᵉrômîm);* their refuge *(miśgāḇ)*

7. See *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 206.

will be the fortresses of rocks *(meṣāḏôṯ selāʿîm),*" while Isa. 25:12 says that God will bring down *(šḥḥ)* Moab's inaccessible, fortified walls *(miḇṣar miśgaḇ ḥômôṯ).* The continuation in 26:5 adds "to the ground," "into the dust."

Otherwise the word refers metaphorically to God as a "refuge," with one exception in the Psalms. Here too the parallel terms are revealing. Ps. 18:3(2) par. 2 S. 22:2-3 engages a whole series of synonyms in describing God as the psalmist's refuge: *selaʿ, meṣûḏâ, ṣûr, māḡēn, qeren,* as well as the vbs. *plṭ* and *ḥāsâ.* According to Ps. 9:10(9), Yahweh is the stronghold of the *daḵ* (NRSV "oppressed"), and a stronghold in times of trouble. According to the refrain in 46:8,12(7,11), Yahweh is "with us" and is thus a "refuge for us." According to 48:4(3), he has shown himself in the citadels of Zion as a refuge. Ps. 59 uses the word 3 times. Yahweh is *ʿōz* and *miśgāḇ* (v. 10[9]), he is *miśgāḇ* and *mānôs* ("place of refuge") on the day of trouble (v. 17[16]); v. 18(17) then repeats v. 10(9) in a slightly altered form. Ps. 62:3(2) (also v. 7) combines *miśgāḇ* with *ṣûr* and *yešûʿâ* and insists that "I shall never be shaken." Ps. 94:22 combines *miśgāḇ* with *ṣûr* and *maḥaseh.* Ps. 144:2 recalls Ps. 18: *meṣûḏâ miśgāḇ, mepallēṭ, māḡēn, bô ḥāsîṯî.*

By contrast, the oracle of woe upon Moab in Jer. 48:1 asserts that Yahweh smashes Moab's refuge: "The fortress is put to shame and broken down *(ḥtt).*"

V. LXX. The LXX translations of *śgb* vary widely. It expresses the nuance of "exalt" in *hypsoún* (3 times for the niphal; once *hágios!*), otherwise it focuses more on the idea of protection and refuge: *diapheúgein, boētheín, lytroún, sṓzein, krataioún.* In a couple of instances, it renders *miśgāḇ* as *sēmeíon* and *sýssēmon,* "sign," whereas otherwise it tends to use terms for "strength," "refuge," and "help": *ischyrós, krataíōma, pýrgos, ochyrós, kataphygḗ, boēthós,* and *antilḗmptōr.*

VI. Qumran. The Qumran passages stay well within the framework of biblical usage. As is often the case in the Psalms, imagery for protection and security predominate. Despite all perils, the petitioner of the *Hodayoth* remains sure that he will be "as one who enters a fortified city *(ʿîr māṣôr),* as one who seeks refuge *(nāʿôz)* behind a high wall *(ḥômâ niśgāḇâ)* until deliverance comes *(plṭ)*" (1QH 6:25). Or God has made him "like a strong tower *(migdal ʿōz),* a high wall *(ḥômâ niśgāḇâ),*" and has "established my edifice upon rock" (7:8). He speaks of God as "my refuge, my high mountain *(mānôs, miśgāḇ),* my stout rock and my fortress *(meṣûḏâ),*" providing shelter and eternal deliverance (9:28-29). Finally, the wish for blessing expressed in 1QSb 5:23-24 says: "May the Lord raise you up to everlasting heights *(rûm),* and as a fortified tower upon a high *(niśgāḇâ)* wall!"

Ringgren

שָׂדֶה śāḏeh; שָׂדַי śāḏay

Contents: I.1. Occurrences; 2. Etymology; 3. Meaning. II. The Phenomenon Itself: 1. Field Location; 2. Right of Possession. III. Developed Fields: 1. Agriculture; 2. Livestock. IV. Undeveloped Fields: 1. Gathering Wild Fruit; 2. Habitat of Wild Animals. V. As a Setting for Action at the Periphery of Life: 1. The Field and Its Caves; 2. War; 3. Criminal Offenses. VI. As a Setting for God's Actions. VII. Qumran.

I. 1. *Occurrences.* Scholars generally assume that Heb. *śāḏeh* and the poetic form *śāḏay* derive from the same Semitic root as Akk. *šadû(m)*, "mountain, highland region, steppe,"[1] which is generally rendered as the ideogram *KUR* (slanted wedges juxtaposed in a triangle depicting a mountainous landscape) and can also be read as *mātu*, "land."[2] This ideogram also serves as a determinative for the names of mountains and lands. The meaning "field, farmland," also occurs as *šd* in Paleo-Canaanite, Canaanite, Phoenician, and Punic texts,[3] as well as in OSA *s²dw*, "hill, terraced landscape," "mountain,"[4] Ugar. *šd*, "field, individual field, in isolated instances incorrectly for *š²d*, 'mountain.'"[5]

2. *Etymology.* Despite the widespread occurrences of the root, the etymology of *śāḏay/śāḏeh* is not certain.[6] Propp argues convincingly in rejecting the derivation of Akk.

śāḏeh. S. Abir, "Das Erdreich als Schöpfungselement in den Mythen der Urgeschichte," *Jud* 35 (1979) 23-27, 125-30; W. F. Albright, "The Names *Shaddai* and *Abram*," *JBL* 54 (1935) 173-204; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 398-99; P. Dhorme, "L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien V," *RB* 31 (1922) 215-33, esp. 230-31; J. Fischer, *Das Buch Jesaja. HSAT* VII/1,1 (1937), 53-54; J. P. Fokkelman, "שדי תרומת in II Sam 1,21a — A Nonexistent Crux," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 290-92; D. N. Freedman, "The Refrain in David's Lamentation over Saul and Jonathan," *Ex orbe religionum. FS G. Widengren. Studies in the History of Religions/Numen Sup* 21 (Leiden, 1972), 115-26, esp. 121-22; E. Fry, "Translating *śade* 'Field' in the OT," *BT* 37 (1986) 412-17; I. Gluska, "The Gender of *śāḏeh* in Mishnaic Hebrew," *Bar-Ilan Annual* 20-21 (1983) 43-66; R. Gordis, "The Biblical Root *ŠDY-ŠD:* Notes on 2 Sam i.21; Jer xvii.14; Ps xci.6; Job v.21," *JTS* 41 (1940) 34-43; A. Heidel, "A Special Usage of the Akkadian Term *Šadû*," *JNES* 8 (1949) 233-35; F. Horst, "Zwei Begriffe für Eigentum (Besitz): נַחֲלָה and אֲחֻזָּה," *Verbannung und Heimkehr. FS W. Rudolph* (Tübingen, 1961), 135-56; H. M. Niemann, "Stadt, Land und Herrschaft" (diss., Rostock, 1990), esp. 28-30; W. H. Propp, "On Hebrew *śāḏe(h)*, 'Highland,'" *VT* 37 (1987) 230-36; L. Rost, "Die Bezeichnungen für Land und Volk im AT," *Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum AT* (Heidelberg, 1965), 76-101, repr. from *FS O. Procksch* (Leipzig, 1934), 125-48; A. Schwarzenbach, *Die geographische Termionologie im Hebräischen des ATs* (Leiden, 1954).

1. Cf. *CAD*, XVII, 58-59.
2. *AHw*, III, 1124-25.
3. *DNSI*, II, 1110; *KAI*, III, 24.
4. Biella, 511; Beeston, 131.
5. *WUS*, no. 2583.
6. Cf. *HAL*, III, 1307a-b.

šadû from a Proto-Semitic root *ṯdw,* "breast" (front side), suggested by Dhorme and developed by Albright, though this derivation is still considered a possibility for Heb. *śāḏeh* "in a fashion."[7] *HAL* does not note this suggestion. The Northwest Semitic witnesses suggest an originally biconsonantal root from which both *śāḏay* and *śāḏeh* might derive through expansion with a third consonant *y/h* and from which through reduplication of the second radical *śdd* (plough furrows, harrow) might have arisen (cf. also Akk. *šiddu,* "side, length, area").[8] On this view *śāḏay/śāḏeh* would denote a defined piece of land capable of cultivation and belonging to a specific owner. The unresolved discussion of the DN → שַׁדַּי *šadday* contributes little to the etymology and understanding of *śāḏeh.*[9]

3. *Meaning.* The nouns *śāḏay/śāḏeh* occur with varying frequency in the OT (12 and 325 times, respectively) depending on context,[10] occurring most frequently in Genesis (the stories of creation, the patriarchs, and the ancestors), Jeremiah (biographical pieces), and Leviticus and Ezekiel (real estate regulations). By contrast, *śāḏay/śāḏeh* do not occur in the prophetic writings Amos, Jonah, Habbakuk, or Zephaniah, or in Esther, Daniel, or Ezra.[11] The LXX translates the terms 215 times as *ágros* (which also occurs quite frequently in the Synoptics) and 80 times as *pedíon,* then in the remaining passages as other terms; the Vg. prefers *ager* and *terra,* but also uses a series of other terms, including *regio, fines,* in a specialized sense *mons* and *locus sublimus,* and others. The meaning of Heb. *śāḏay/śāḏeh* comes closest to Eng. "field, open field." Propp's suggestion that one add a more specialized meaning "highland" to the words' lexicography (cf. Nu. 22:41; 23:9,14,28; Jgs. 5:18; 2 S. 1:21; Job 40:20; Ps. 80:14[Eng. 13]; 96:12; 104:11) reflects a salient observation and underscores the multifaceted nature of the terms *śāḏay/śāḏeh,* though they probably circumscribe the particular type, quality, or dimensions of a piece of land less than they serve as functional terms encompassing the various possibilities for using and exploiting such property. Hence words such as → ארץ *'ereṣ,* → אדמה *'ᵃḏāmâ,*[12] and → מדבר *miḏbār* (excepting Josh. 8:24; Ezk. 29:5, though unconfirmed by LXX and Vg.), which describe characteristic types of land[13] rarely or never appear in the same context or parallel with *śāḏay/śāḏeh* even though connections do indeed exist with these terms as well: "When no plant of the field *(śāḏeh)* was yet in the earth *('ereṣ)* and no herb of the field *(śāḏeh)* had yet sprung up — for Yahweh God had not caused it to rain upon the earth *('ereṣ),* and there was no one to till the ground *('ᵃḏāmâ)*" (Gen. 2:5). "Fields *(śāḏeh)* shall be bought in this land *('ereṣ)*" (Jer. 32:43). Cain draws Abel out to the field *(śāḏeh),* where he slays

---

7. Dhorme, 230-31; Albright, 183-84; Propp, 233.

8. *KAI,* III, 24; *HAL,* III, 1306-7; cf. H. Guthe, "Eggen und furchen im AT," *Beiträge zur alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. FS Karl Budde. BZAW* 34 (1920), 75-82; *AHw,* III, 1230.

9. Cf. M. Weippert, "שַׁדַּי *šadday* (divine name)," *TLOT,* III, 1304-10; G. W. Nebe, "Psalm 104:11 aus Höhle 4 von Qumran (4QPs[d] und der Ersatz des Gottesnamens," *ZAW* 93 (1981) 285 nn. 5-6.

10. Schwarzenbach, 82-87.

11. Ibid., 82.

12. Rost, 77-86.

13. Schwarzenbach, 93-96, 133-36.

him (Gen. 4:8). But the ground *(ʾᵃḏāmâ)* takes in Abel's blood (v. 9). Hence a field *(śāḏeh)* belongs to the land or earth,[14] and the ground *(ʾᵃḏāmâ)* is the substance of the field *(śāḏeh)*. The "field" does not exhibit the cosmic, territorial significance of the ground or land nor the mythical, ecological quality of the earth *(ʾᵃḏāmâ)*. The difference between the *śāḏay/śāḏeh* and the steppe *(miḏbār)* is that insufficient rainfall prevented the latter from being exploited as intensively as the former; as a result, the latter was probably used primarily for small-livestock farming. Hence despite their mutual relationship, these terms are sufficiently delineated from one another.

II. The Phenomenon Itself.

1. *Field Location.* A comparison between *śāḏay/śāḏeh* and *miḏbār* clearly shows that the former was always concretely related to a city or settlement, something demonstrated by the portrayal of Jacob's stay in Shechem. According to Gen. 33:18-19, he pitched his tent "before the city" and ultimately acquired part *(ḥēleq)* of the *śāḏeh* on which he had settled. This close proximity to the city explains how the son of the regional prince was able to encounter and seize Dinah, Jacob's daughter (Gen. 34:2). The story does not say where this took place. Jacob's sons were "with his cattle in the field" and returned to the tent encampment.

The same situation is presupposed in the story of how David sought shelter from Saul, who had become mistrustful. Saul's son and David's friend, Jonathan, leaves the city with David and goes out into the field (*śāḏeh;* 1 S. 20:11) where David also hides (vv. 5,24).[15] Jonathan seeks him out there later in order to confer with him (v. 35) after sending the little boy who had come with him back to the city as a precaution (v. 40). Hence this field is located immediately at the edge of the city area.[16]

The account of the siege of the city of Samaria reflects the same configuration (2 K. 7:12), otherwise the Samaritans' fear would be incomprehensible, namely, that the Arameans who were laying siege to the city might be hiding in the field in order to take the Samaritans alive when the latter left the city in search of food. Hence every city had its field (Gen. 41:48, Egypt); in Lachish it was the city's field (Neh. 11:30), in Geba the collective fields (Neh. 12:29), or simply city fields in the larger sense (1 Ch. 6:41[56]; Neh. 12:44). The field is in fact part of the city or settlement, which is also why both city and field are included in Yahweh's blessing: "The blessing of Yahweh was on all that he had, in house (→ בית *bayiṯ*) and field" (Gen. 39:5, Pharaoh). "Blessed shall you be in the city, and blessed shall you be in the field" (Dt. 28:3). Hence the existence of the ruined city "in the field" is an appropriate image for the peril threatening Samaria (Mic. 1:6).

2. *Right of Possession.* If, however, this interrelated nature of city and field does presuppose that the fields are used in an ongoing fashion, it also presupposes a concrete

14. Rost, 80-86.
15. Concerning "hide," see V.1 below.
16. See V.2-3 below.

system of ownership, e.g., Joshua's field in 1 S. 6:14. The portion a private person owned is generally designated by → חלק *ḥēleq;* the tribes, clans, and families all received a portion after the land conquest (Josh. 15–19). Specific stories relate the circumstances of how, e.g., Caleb received his portion (Josh. 15:13-14), similarly with regard to Othniel's demands and apportionment (15:18). Fields that have been lost from ownership can be reacquired through the appropriate steps under certain conditions governing inheritance, e.g., through Levirate marriage (Ruth 4:5).[17] Upon returning home, the widow pursues the same end when addressing the king, who appoints an official for her to help her reacquire her property (2 K. 8:3,5). Yahweh alone can alter ownership circumstances (Jer. 6:12; 8:10; 32:44).

Several passages speak about field portions in connection with the apparently legitimate method of changing ownership through sale and purchase. For a sum of money paid to Ephron, Abraham acquires part of a field for burying his wife in a cave located at one end of the field (Gen. 23:9,13,17,20), even though Ephron, perhaps for legal reasons involving land rights, had offered him this field as a gift. Such acquisition through purchase is designated by the word → קנה *qānâ/miqneh* (Gen. 25:10; 49:30; 50:13; Neh. 5:16; Jer. 32:7-9,15,25,43,44), the sale itself by → מכר *māḵar* (Lev. 27:20; Ruth 4:3). Possession of a field can in times of distress also be divided (2 S. 19:30[29]), pledged (Neh. 5:3), surrendered (Neh. 5:5), though also returned (2 S. 9:7; Neh. 5:11).

A woman can also acquire real estate for her family (Prov. 31:16). During the later period, possession of a field (alongside movable assets) is called *ʼᵃḥuzzâ,* which was subject to the regulations of the Sabbath and Jubilee Year (Lev. 25:31; 27:16-17,18,19,22). Banned fields (i.e., fields that had passed to Yahweh) could not be disposed of at all (Lev. 27:28). Inherited property was also excluded from sale (1 K. 21:3).[18] A person should not covet a neighbor's field[19] (Dt. 5:21; cf. Ex. 20:17, though without *śāḏeh;* Mic. 2:2); such would constitute unjust acquisition.

Within a larger framework, however, the concept of "field" can refer not only to an individual's or city's possession, but also to political orientation, e.g., the field of Moab (NRSV "country," Gen. 36:35; Nu. 21:20; Ruth 1:1,2,6,22; 2:6; 4:3; 1 Ch. 1:46; 8:8), Edom (Gen. 32:4[3]; Jgs. 5:4), the Philistines (1 S. 6:1; 27:7,11), Israel (Jgs. 20:6), Ephraim (Ob. 19), Aram (Hos. 12:13[12]), the Amalekites (Gen. 14:7), and Samaria (Ob. 19). These references are probably not to sharply delineated political and geographical territories *('ereṣ),* which were also not intensively cultivated for agriculture; perhaps these designations include the transition to steppe regions.

III. Developed Fields.

1. *Agriculture.* Given the relationship between locality and field disclosed under II.1 above, it is to be expected that the field surrounding the city was cultivated with the

17. G. Wallis, "Das Jobeljahr-Gesetz, eine Novelle zum Sabbathjahr-Gesetz," *MIO* 15 (1969) 337-45.

18. A. Alt, "Der Stadtstaat Samaria," *KlSchr,* III (1959), 264-66.

19 → חמד *ḥāmaḏ (chāmadh),* IV, 452ff.

idea of providing food, whence also the commensurate Greek translation *ágros* and the Latin *ager.* Those who "go out *(yāṣā')* into the field" do so in order to work there (Jgs. 9:27), e.g., to "glean among the ears of grain" (Ruth 2:2,3,22). Farmers return from their work in the field (Ex. 23:16; Jgs. 19:16; 1 S. 11:5; Ps. 107:37). One binds and stacks sheaves in the field (Gen. 37:7) or plows the field with a pair of oxen (1 S. 11:5). Fields were measured according to furrow lengths (1 S. 14:14). Various kinds of grains were sown (Gen. 47:24; Ex. 1:14; 9:19), including wheat and barley (Ex. 23:16; 1 Ch. 11:13). "You shall not sow your field with two kinds of seed" (Lev. 19:19). "Six years you shall sow your field" (Lev. 25:3,4). "When you reap the harvest of your land, you shall not reap to the very edges[20] of your field," but rather leave that yield for the poor, the widows, and the aliens; nor should one "gather gleanings" (Lev. 19:9; Dt. 24:19). In any event, the harvest of the field is God's gift and blessing, and a failed harvest is a sign of disfavor (Gen. 39:5; Dt. 28:16). Successful sowing and the resultant good harvest are acknowledged with thanksgiving (Ex. 23:11; Dt. 26:11; Sir. 40:22a). Locust swarms can completely decimate a harvest (Joel 1:4,12). In times of extreme distress some people even harvest the fields of others (Job 24:6).

The produce of the field includes not only grain but also the fruit of the vine and of trees. In the view of the prophet Ezekiel, who often uses tree imagery, the planting at least of the large trees such as the cedar is the work of Yahweh, and their growth reflects God's own actions (Ezk. 31:4,5). The fruit of the trees is a divine gift (31:15; 34:27). Yahweh can make small trees grow higher and high trees shrink (17:24), or even destroy them through catastrophes (12:19). God's wrath pours down upon the trees of the field (Ex. 9:25; 10:15; Jer. 7:20). God's people, however, are also directed to plant fruit trees (Lev. 19:23), which will yield fruit if the people are obedient. According to Joel 1:12, these trees include the fig tree, the pomegranate, the date palm, and the apple tree. Such trees are to be spared rather than cut down when a city is besieged (Dt. 20:19-20), suggesting that such cultivated trees were located in the green belt around the city.

The fruit of the vine was also viewed as a product of the field (Jgs. 9:27), and the gifts of the grapevine were also exposed to the dangers of catastrophic events (Mal. 3:11). Cucumbers are also reckoned among the fruits of the field (Nu. 11:5), and although they did require the kind of damp ground found in Egypt, they were apparently also cultivated in Palestine (Isa. 1:8). Lentils were similarly reckoned among the gifts of the field (2 S. 23:11 par. 1 Ch. 11:13; cf. also Gen. 25:29ff.; 2 S. 17:28); beans are also mentioned in this context.

2. *Livestock.* The field is also used for livestock herding, and this context especially includes the *migrāš,* the "pastureland, uncultivated land."[21] Jacob's sons are engaged in livestock herding (Gen. 34:5; 37:12-17). Livestock in such contexts generally refers to small livestock, including sheep and goats. By contrast, cattle were considered more

---

20. → פאה *pē'â,* XI, 461-63.
21. Schwarzenbach, 88-90; *HAL,* II, 546b.

domestic animals and were taken out to pasture only in special circumstances (1 Ch. 27:29). Keeping cattle in pasturage doubtless depended on the presence of field springs (Gen. 29:2). Small livestock was also driven out to steppe pastures.[22] The pasturage or "open land" (so NRSV) around the city *(migrāš)* refers especially to the area from which the Levites were provisioned in the cities assigned to them (Lev. 25:34; cf. Josh. 21:2-39; 1 Ch. 6:40-66[55-81]).

IV. Undeveloped Fields.

1. *Gathering Wild Fruit.* Alongside the yield of cultivated fields, the Israelites apparently also extensively exploited uncultivated areas. The extent to which such exploitation included *śîaḥ*, "bushes," or → עשׂב *'ēśeḇ yereq* in such areas depends on whether the reference is only to cultivated plants or also to wild or freely growing plants. The latter is intended at least in references to plant eaters living freely in the open (Nu. 22:4). During the Sabbath and Jubilee Year, such freely growing plants are included among human food (Lev. 25:12; 26:4; cf. Dt. 11:15) and are then viewed as God's direct gift. The *ṣîṣ* of the field is to be understood similarly (Isa. 40:6), as is *ṣemaḥ* (Ezk. 16:7; Sir. 40:22b *spóros!*). 2 K. 4:39-41 shows that gathering the fruits of the field with insufficient knowledge can be dangerous. There someone goes out into the field to gather mallows; he finds field vines, gathers bitter gourds (of the field[23]) from them, fills his cloak, brings them home, and cuts them up into a pot, "not knowing what they were." Although such gourds are not really poisonous in the strict sense, they are extremely bitter and act as strong purgatives. Mandrakes have a similarly narcotic character *(dûḏā'îm)* and were used as stimulants (Gen. 30:14-16; Cant. 7:14[13]). Hosea mentions poisonous plants of the field (Hos. 10:4) when reproaching the people's empty oaths and broken covenants. Fruits were doubtless also picked from trees growing in uncultivated fields, and, not surprisingly, those who worked such fields or used them as hunting grounds often took on the smell of the field itself (Gen. 27:27).

2. *Habitat of Wild Animals.* Since such undeveloped fields were indeed able to yield nourishment, they also provided a habitat for wild, undomesticated animals. Passages speaking of *ḥayyaṯ haśśāḏeh* in contrast to *bah^{a}môṯ haśśāḏeh* (Ps. 8:8[7]; Joel 1:20; 2:22; cf. Ex. 9:19) generally refer to wild animals. The directive for human beings to name the animals (Gen. 2:19) includes not only domestic animals but also animals living in the wild (if such a distinction is even being envisioned at all for the primeval period). Among the animals of the field, the serpent was craftiest of all (Gen. 3:1), whence also it became cursed (3:14), having henceforth to live in enmity with human beings. The open field is also the habitat of jackals (Isa. 43:20), the doe (Cant. 2:7; 3:5; Jer. 14:5), the gazelle (Cant. 2:7; 3:5; cf. 2 S. 2:18), and the wild goat (Ps. 104:18).

---

22. → מדבר *miḏbār,* VIII, 87-118; *AuS,* IV, 171; VI, 180-86, 196-203; J. Feliks, "Rind," *BHHW,* III, 1602-3; M. L. Henry, "Schaf," *BHHW,* III, 1681-82.

23. J. Feliks, "Koloquinthe," *BHHW,* II, 975.

Such wild animals are paralleled by the birds of the air (Jer. 15:3; Ezk. 38:20), the animals of the field (Job 5:23; 40:20), and the "creeping things of the ground" (Hos. 2:20[18]; 4:3), indeed "all that moves in the field" (Ps. 50:11; 80:14[13]). The topography and ecology of the field ensures their habitat, places of concealment, and food (Ps. 104:11-14a,20-21). At night they hunt for food; during the day they hide in caves from human beings and from the diurnal animals (104:22).

V. As a Setting for Action at the Periphery of Life. The topography of this landscape is characterized by the limestone cave formations of the Syro-Palestinian hill country. That is, the "field" is not an unbroken expanse, which is why the Greek translation *pedíon* is not always accurate. To that extent, Propp's proposal to introduce the meaning "highland" to the word field of *śāḏeh* is justified.

1. *The Field and Its Caves.* The topography of these areas offered shelter and protection to both human beings and animals.[24] David repeatedly sought refuge from Saul in caves (see II.2 above; also 1 S. 24:4[3]; 22:1; 2 S. 23:13; 1 Ch. 11:15). For this reason, too, such locales were suitable for grave sites and cemeteries (Gen. 23:11,17,19; 49:29,30; 50:13), though also for hiding supplies of wheat, barley, oil, and honey (Jer. 41:8), especially since such supplies could not only be hidden but also stored in cool, shaded places away from the high outside temperatures common to this landscape. Whenever someone is accidentally discovered in a field, it is almost always someone who has been hiding in a cave (1 S. 30:11).

2. *War.* Precisely because of its topography, fields often provided the setting for military encounters, attacks, and skirmishes. Here the notion of the peaceful departure from the city for one's daily work shows its opposite, bellicose side. When the people or the army mobilizes (Jgs. 9:32; 2 S. 11:23; 18:6; Jer. 6:25), it does so to mount a sortie, a rush (Jgs. 9:44), to take up battle positions in a field (2 S. 10:8), to lie in wait (Jgs. 9:32; at night in v. 43), or to set up camp in anticipation of battle (1 S. 14:15; 2 S. 11:11; Jer. 40:7,13). Once the battle actually started, the field then became a field of death for many warriors (Jgs. 20:31ff.,35,44-45; 1 S. 4:10) whose flesh the birds of the air or carrion eaters devoured (1 S. 17:44; 1 K. 14:11; 16:4; 21:24; Ezk. 33:27). If no one interred the corpses or protected them from carrion eaters, as Rizpah did with such self-sacrifice with regard to the corpses of her slain relatives (2 S. 21:10), or fetched the corpses from the field as did the warriors of Jabesh-gilead in their devotion to Saul and his sons (1 S. 31:12-13), then ultimately only bleached bones remained (Nu. 19:16; 2 K. 9:37; Jer. 9:21[22]; Ezk. 37:1; 39:15). Such a battlefield would have offered a gruesome scene, with bloody, maimed, plundered, chewed corpses or gnawed bones. David's eulogy for Saul and Jonathan resonates with such imagery (2 S. 1:17-23), as does Jeremiah's lament: "If I go out into the field, look — those killed by the sword! And if I enter the city, look — those sick with famine!" (Jer. 14:18a-b).

---

24. Schwarzenbach, 49.

3. *Criminal Offenses.* The various clefts and crevasses on the surface of the open field lend to such fields an eerie appearance; moreover, not only do the bodies of those killed on the battlefield lie there and rot or are devoured, but according to the Dtr diction of the book of Jeremiah, the impious cults are also practiced there (Jer. 13:27; 17:3). All sorts of things can take place in the enormous expanse of such fields. It is there that Ahijah the Shilonite secretly designates Jeroboam as king of Israel and rival king to Solomon (1 K. 11:29). It is there that a young woman promised to another man can be dishonored without her cries for help being of any use; she is declared innocent because her cries did not reach anyone's ears (Dt. 22:25a,27). A person can die in the open field, and only the corpse remains or even just gnawed bones. One legal regulation concerns remedying the unclean nature of such a field and involves cultic cleansing, interment, and the cleansing of those who do the interring (Nu. 19:16). Those who eat the improperly bled meat of certain cadavers "mangled by beasts" (Ex. 22:30[31]; cf. Lev. 17:15-16) become unclean themselves, since "mangled" animals have not been properly slaughtered (Ex. 12:6,21).[25]

The setting of all these secret, eerie happenings is the open field, the same kind of field into which Cain lures his brother Abel in order to kill him (Ger. 4:8). The son of the widow of Tekoa allegedly also abducts his brother out into the field and slays him there (2 S. 14:4-6). Because there were no witnesses, the text specifically mentions the attempt at hiding the deed (v. 6b). Cain deceived himself into thinking he was not seen; when Yahweh queries him, he acts as if he knows nothing and is unprepared when the accusatory voice of the blood that the ground had taken up rises in witness against him (Gen. 4:9). Hence the open field is both the refuge of the persecuted and the setting of criminal acts; this semantic ambivalence seems to inhere in the term *śāḏeh.*

VI. As a Setting for God's Actions. Yet the open field remains the setting of God's own actions. The multifaceted nature of the term *śāḏeh* and the diverse imagery associated with it make the broad scenery of the open field an appropriate setting for all those life events that are inconceivable without the awareness, intervention, and hand of God. The exilic prophet Ezekiel is especially inclined to view the field as the locus of Yahweh's intervention and judgment. Perhaps because of its stony barrenness, it dooms the great armored aquatic lizard, the crocodile (Ezk. 29:5), the image used to predict the fate of Egypt (cf. 29:5). The field is not the habitat of aquatic animals. On the other hand, the hour of danger during birth for Israel is precisely the open field (16:5) from which Yahweh alone can deliver it. The defeat of Gog on the battlefield and the loss of its weapons and equipment largely satisfy the need for firewood such that wood need be taken from neither the field nor the forest (39:10). Ezekiel is unmistakably already using the field symbolically here. Micah sees the judgment upon guilty Jerusalem in Mt. Zion itself being plowed into a field (Mic. 3:12 = Jer. 26:18) and in its transformation into a wooded height, all of which characterize the open field. Hence Isaiah also summons the animals of the open field to participate in the punishment and

25. → שׁחט *šāḥaṭ.*

in carrying out the sentence upon the rulers of this city (Isa. 56:9). So also does the psalmist lament the destruction of the land by the wild animals of the field, the wild pigs (Ps. 80:14[13]; cf. Isa. 5:1-7).

On the other hand, the field of Zoan in the Nile Delta provides the setting for Yahweh's signs and wonders (Ps. 78:12,43). The animals of the field are also God's possessions (50:11), and as such, the field along with all its inhabitants and the forests sing the praises of Yahweh the king (96:12 = 1 Ch. 16:32). During the coming salvific period, the field will bear its fruit in abundance (Joel 2:22). In the view of Eliphaz the Temanite, the wise person is already in league with the stones of the field and enjoys peace with the wild animals of the field (Job 5:23).

The multifaceted imagery associated with the open field, both the cultivated and uncultivated field, the well-ordered and the eerie, rugged field, occupies a fixed place in ancient Israel's understanding of itself and of the world and in its understanding of the space in which its life unfolds as a gift of its God, Yahweh.

The notion of *śāḏeh* is thus a comprehensive one involving the entirety of ancient Israel's understanding of the world. The *śāḏeh* provides the setting in which life plays out in all its stages, providing nourishment for human existence, a place of refuge from danger, a hiding place for precious goods, the eerie setting for the worship of idols, the battlefield for bloody wars, the setting for criminal deeds, and ultimately the place of rest at which the deceased are reunited with their ancestors. In that sense the *śāḏeh* provides the setting for life in the larger sense. Above it all, however, God's organizing, chastising, and ultimately atoning hand of peace is discernible.

VII. Qumran. Among the 13 occurrences of the term in the Qumran writings (the fragmentary character of 4Q159 1, II, 5 with *hśdh,* and 513 18, 4 with *mn hśdh* make them uncertain), several correspond to OT usage, including 1Q22 3, 1 (cf. Ex. 23:10-11; Lev. 25:2-7); 4Q158 10-12, 7 (par. Ex. 22:4[5]); 11QT 50:5 (par. Nu. 19:16); 66:4,7 (par. Dt. 22:25,27).

CD 9:9 (= 5Q12 1, 4) condemns oath taking in the open field because of the absence of legal authorities. The Sabbath regulations in CD 10:20ff. prohibit fieldwork but do allow the eating of field fruits that would otherwise spoil. The development of the royal law in 11QT 57 prohibits the king from coveting fields and vineyards (ll. 20-21). 4Q381 1, 6 contains an expression unique within the context of creation: *tbw'wt śdh* (though cf. 2 K. 8:6; 2 Ch. 31:5); the governing verb is missing.

Wallis

שֶׂה *śeh*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Meaning and Word Field; 4. LXX. II. OT Usage: 1. Secular Usage; 2. Comparisons; 3. The Cult. III. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The Hebrew noun *śeh* is of Common Semitic origin. Corresponding equivalents include Akk. *šûm* III/*šu'u* I, Assyr. *śūbu,* Ugar. *š,* and Arab. *šā'/šāt.*[1] This context also includes Phoen. *ś* and Aram. *š't* (pl. abs. *š'n*), *t'h,* and *t't'.*[2] The connection with Egyp. *sɜ,* "son," and Copt. *esou,* "sheep," is disputed.[3]

Although its etymology is uncertain,[4] *śeh* as a primary noun does derive from a monosyllabic stem **śai* with elision of the medial *i* in Canaanite, evidence of which may still be attested in Sam. *šī.*[5]

2. *Occurrences.* The noun *śeh* occurs 47 times in the OT,[6] including 13 in Exodus, 7 in Ezekiel, 5 each in Leviticus and Deuteronomy, 4 each in Genesis, 1 Samuel, and Isaiah, and 1 each in Numbers, Joshua, Judges, Jeremiah, and the Psalms.

A distinction between cultic and secular usage yields 25 religious or cultic passages and 22 secular or legal passages, including the passages using *śeh* metaphorically.

3. *Meaning and Word Field.* As a rule, *śeh* refers to the individual animal within a small livestock herd (1 S. 17:34, *śeh mēhā'ēḏer*) and can include both → כבשׂ *keḇeś,* "sheep," and → עז *'ēz,* "goats." This meaning is suggested by the close relationship between this noun and the generic term → צאן *ṣō'n,* under which *śeh* is subsumed as *nomen unitatis.*[7] The noun itself does not indicate whether its meaning is to be restricted to young animals ("the young of sheep [lamb] and goats [kid]"[8] as presupposed

---

śeh. F. Blome, *Die Opfermaterie in Babylonien und Israel* (Rome, 1934); F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal Life in Palestine* (Jerusalem, 1935), esp. 122-25; B. Brentjes, *Die Haustierwerdung im Orient. Neue Brehm-Bücherei* 344 (1965), esp. 22-32; J. Clutton-Brock, "The Early History of Domesticated Animals in Western Asia," *Sumer* 36 (1980) 37-41; G. Dalman, *AuS,* VI (1939), esp. 180-203; M. Delcor, "Quelques termes relatifs à l'élevage des ovins en hébreu classique et dans les langues sémitiques voisines," *QuadSem* 5 (1978) 105-24; M.-L. Henry, "Schaf," *BHHW,* III, 1681-82; R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967); I. Seibert, *Hirt-Herde-König. Zur Herausbildung des Königtums in Mesopotamien. DAWB* 53 (1969).

1. *AHw,* III, 1255; *WUS,* no. 2561; *UT,* no. 2364; Wehr, 449.
2. *KAI* 24.8,11; 26.III.2; *DNSI,* II, 1094-95; Beyer, 720.
3. → כבשׂ *keḇeś,* VII, 44; but cf. also *HAL,* III, 1310b.
4. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1310; → VII, 44.
5. Meyer, II, §58, no. 21.
6. Both C. Dohmen (→ VII, 48) and Lisowsky count 43 occurrences.
7. → VII, 44.
8. *KBL*², 916.

by various sacrificial laws (Ex. 12:3ff.; Lev. 12:8; 22:28). The word field suggests rather that *śeh* lies wholly within the semantic field of *ṣō'n*.[9]

A closer specification of *śeh* suggests that in both secular and cultic usage it can include *keḇeś/keśeḇ* and *'ēz* (Gen. 30:32; Nu. 15:11; Dt. 14:4). Ezk. 34:17 mentions in this context *'ayil* and *'attûḏ*, while Lev. 5:7 and 12:8 summarize the previously mentioned sacrificial animals *(kiśbâ, s^e'îraṯ 'izzîm,* and *keḇeś ben-š^enāṯô)* in the expression *dê śeh.*

In enumerations *śeh* occurs especially in fixed expressions with *šôr*, whereby *šôr* generally stands first (Ex. 34:19; Lev. 22:23; Dt. 17:1; etc.). A clear analogy emerges here with the pair *bāqār/ṣō'n*,[10] with which *šôr* and *śeh* are used synonymously (Ex. 21:37; 1 S. 14:32ff.).

Whereas *ṣō'n ûḇāqār* or *bāqār w^eṣō'n* refer to livestock herds in the overall makeup, *śeh* and *šôr* characterize the latter with regard to individual types. Here the connection between *šôr* and *śeh* is established not only with the copula *w^e* (Ex. 34:19; Lev. 22:23; Dt. 17:1; 1 S. 14:34), but frequently with particles such as *'ô* (Ex. 21:37[Eng. 22:1]; Lev. 22:28; Dt. 22:1), *'im . . . 'im* (Lev. 27:26; Dt. 18:3), or *min . . . 'aḏ* (Ex. 22:3[4]; 1 S. 15:3). Legal statutes and inventories of possessions (banned goods) also indicate this relationship with *ḥ^amôr* (Ex. 22:3,8-9[4,9-10]; Josh. 6:21; Jgs. 6:4) and *gāmāl* (1 S. 15:3), in which cases the sequence can vary.

4. *LXX.* The LXX translates *śeh,* like *ṣō'n,* most frequently (39 times) with *próbaton.* In 3 instances it renders *śeh* as *amnós,* twice as *chriós,* and once each as *poímnion* and *chímaros.*

II. OT Usage.

1. *Secular Usage.* The previous discussion clearly shows that OT use of *śeh* largely corresponds to that of the noun *ṣō'n* and must be understood from the perspective of that noun. Like *ṣō'n,* so *śeh* refers to the sheep and goats that have been collected together into the kind of flock that throughout history has constituted the economic foundation of nomads and seminomads in the Near East.[11] The term *śeh* generally refers to the individual animal within the small livestock herd and by using it as *pars pro toto* underscores the specific meaning of *ṣō'n* as a kind of mixed type.

When a *śeh* is carried away from the flock by a predator under the very eyes of the shepherd, the reference is to a single animal (sheep or goat, 1 S. 17:34). Although Jacob speculates with his "animal divination" (Gen. 30:25ff.) that he will come to possess considerable livestock, his agreement with Laban focuses on every individual animal *(kol-śeh)* of the flock with abnormal coloring (v. 32). 1 S. 14:32-34 expresses the correct relationship between *śeh* and *ṣō'n* in a different way. The people took small livestock, oxen, and calves as booty *(ṣō'n ûḇāqār ûḇ^enê bāqār)* and intended to slaugh-

9. See *HAL,* III, 1310-11.
10. → בקר *bāqār,* II, 210-11.
11. → צאן *ṣō'n,* XII, 199-201.

ter and eat these in insubordination (v. 32). Hence Saul commands that "all bring their oxen *(šôrô)* or their small livestock [*śᵉyēhû;* NRSV 'sheep'], and slaughter them here, and eat; and do not sin against Yahweh by eating with the blood" (v. 34).

Legal regulations also reflect the value of the individual animal, which is why *śeh* also appears here alongside *ṣō'n.* Whoever steals an animal *(śeh)* from the small livestock herd must pay back four animals *(ṣō'n)* to replace the one (Ex. 21:37[22:1]; cf. 22:3,8-9[4,9-10]). Dt. 22:1 charges every Israelite with returning to its owner (here *'āḥ*) any individual animal *(śeh)* that has strayed off.

The term *śeh* occurs especially as *pars pro toto* within enumerations. A particularly good example of such usage is Josh. 6:21, which describes the inhabitants of Jericho and their livestock that have been devoted to destruction as "both men and women, young and old, oxen *(šôr),* small livestock [*śeh;* NRSV 'sheep'], and donkeys *(ḥᵃmôr)*" (cf. Jgs. 6:4; 1 S. 15:3; 22:19).

The term *śeh* also represents the type in the oracle of woe Isa. 7:23-25, where an addendum[12] portrays how the hills will be filled with briers and thorns and "will become a place where cattle *(šôr)* are let loose and where small livestock [*śeh;* NRSV 'sheep'] tread" (v. 25).

2. *Comparisons.* A few passages use *śeh,* again commensurate with *ṣō'n,* as a metaphor for Israel. Jer. 50:17 compares Israel to an animal separated from the flock *(śeh pᵉzûrâ)* that is being chased by a lion. By contrast, Ezk. 34:17-22 predicts that Yahweh will again care for Israel as his flock *(ṣō'nî)* by establishing justice *(šāpaṭ)* among the individual animals (*bên śeh lāśeh,* vv. 17,22), between the fat *(śeh biryâ)*[13] and the lean (*śeh rāzâ,* v. 20). The psalmist who confesses in Ps. 119:176 that he has gone astray *(tā'â)* compares himself to a lost animal of the flock *(kᵉśeh 'ōbēd).* In the fourth Servant Song (Isa. 53), Israel similarly compares itself to a flock gone astray (*kaṣṣō'n tā'înû,* v. 6), with which v. 7 then juxtaposes the servant who suffers patiently, "like a lamb *(kaśśeh)* that is led to the slaughter, and like a sheep *(kᵉrāḥēl)* that before its shearers is silent."

3. *The Cult.* As part of the *ṣō'n,* the *śeh* belongs in an unspoken fashion to the oldest sacrificial materials (cf. Gen. 22:7-8). Hence any cultic instructions and sacrificial regulations involving *ṣō'n* or *keḇeś* and *'ēz* can basically be applied to *śeh* as well.[14]

Together with *šôr, śeh* represents the individual animal customarily used for animal sacrifice *(zeḇaḥ)* and burnt offerings *('ōlâ)* (Nu. 15:11; cf. Gen. 22:7-8; Isa. 43:23; 66:3). Accordingly both terms also occur in passages discussing the value and appropriate use of individual sacrificial animals. According to Dt. 17:1, an animal with a blemish *(mûm)* or any other defect *(dāḇār rā')* is unacceptable for sacrifice. Both the *šôr* and the *śeh* belong without question to animals classified as clean and edible

12. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), in loc.
13. See *HAL,* I, 156b.
14. → כבשׂ *keḇeś,* VII, 50-52; עז *'ēz,* X, 581-82; צאן *ṣō'n,* XII, 205-7.

(14:4); moreover, the priest has a claim to certain portions of the sacrificial animal (*hazzᵉrōaʿ wᵉhallᵉḥāyayim wᵉhaqqēḇâ*, 18:3). Regulations regarding firstlings *(bᵉḵôr, peṭer)* and their redemption *(pāḏâ)* specifically mention *šôr* and *śeh*. All firstborn animals belong to Yahweh (Ex. 34:19) and thus cannot be consecrated to him again (Lev. 27:26). Only animals that, like the donkey *(ḥᵃmôr)*, are unsuitable as sacrificial animals must be replaced by an animal from among the small livestock *(śeh)*, or their neck must be broken *(ʿārap)* (Ex. 13:13; 34:20).

Cultic texts, too, use the term *śeh* only when emphasizing the individual animal (cf. Ezk. 45:15: *śeh ʾaḥaṯ min-haṣṣōʾn*), which might explain why the noun *śeh* occurs here much less frequently than *ṣōʾn, keḇeś,* or *ʿēz* and why it occurs particularly in the more detailed regulations of texts dating to a later period, as is clearly the case in the Passover tradition in Ex. 12. The older regulation already mentions the slaughter of small livestock *(ṣōʾn)* within the clans *(mišpāḥôṯ)*. By contrast, P goes into more detail and uses the noun *śeh* no fewer than 5 times, stipulating that each family *(bêṯ-ʾāḇōṯ)* is to take but one individual animal *(śeh)*, one that under certain circumstances is to be shared with a neighbor (vv. 3-4). It is to be taken from the sheep *(min-hakkᵉḇāśîm)* or from the goats *(min-hāʿizzîm)* and should be suitable for sacrifice *(tāmîm, zāḵār, ben-šānâ)* (v. 5).

The sacrificial laws of Lev. 1ff. similarly do not mention *śeh* except in the addendum to the sin offering *(ḥaṭṭāʾṯ)*. The addendum contains a "neediness clause" (Lev. 5:7) stipulating that those who cannot afford an appropriate sacrificial animal *(dê śeh)* can replace such with "two turtledoves or two pigeons, one for a sin offering and the other for a burnt offering."[15] An almost identical addendum accompanies the purificatory offering of the woman who has just given birth (12:8).[16]

In the catalog of defects rendering a sacrificial animal unsuitable (Lev. 22:17ff.), *śeh* similarly appears only in an addendum regarding a misshapen limb (v. 23) and in the subsequent individual regulations regarding mother animals and their young (v. 28).

III. Qumran. In the Qumran writings, *śeh,* like *keḇeś* and *ʿēz,* occurs only in OT citations in 11QT.

Waschke

15. See K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 74-75.
16. Ibid., 157-59.

שׂושׂ/שׂישׂ *śwś/śyś;* מָשׂוֹשׂ *māśôś;* שָׂשׂוֹן *śāśôn*

Contents: I. Etymology and Distribution. II. Occurrences and Meaning: 1. The Verb; 2. The Noun *māśôś;* 3. The Noun *śāśôn.* III. 1. Sirach; 2. LXX; 3. Qumran.

I. Etymology and Distribution. Since the root *śwś/śyś* does not seem to derive etymologically from any extra-Hebrew source, T. Nöldeke's reference to Arab. *šawšāʾt,* "fast (female camels)," is rather hypothetical.[1]

The verb occurs 27 times in the OT and, given the witness of all concerned passages, means "rejoice." The reason or object of such rejoicing is added syntactically by *b^e* (Ps. 35:9; 40:17[Eng. 16]; 70:5[4]; 119:14; Isa. 61:10 [here in the *figura etymologica śôś ʾāśîś*]; 65:19) or *ʿal* (Dt. 28:63; 30:9; Ps. 119:14 [read *mēʿal,* "more than"],162; Isa. 62:5; Jer. 32:41; Zeph. 3:17). The verb occurs only 8 times with a divine subject (Dt. 28:63[bis]; 30:9[bis]; Isa. 62:5; 65:19; Jer. 32:41; Zeph. 3:17).

Its noun derivatives include *māśôś* and *śāśôn,* both meaning "joy, jubilation."[2]

The term *māśôś* occurs 17 times,[3] though one must distinguish the 2 occurrences of *māśôś* II (see discussion below). Ps. 48:3(2) and Hos. 2:13(11) are probably the only preexilic occurrences. Most of the occurrences date to the exilic period (Isa. 32:13-14; Jer. 49:25; Lam. 2:15; 5:15; Ezk. 24:25) or are found in Trito-Isaiah (4 times), and in extremely late redactions to Isaiah (Isa. 24:8[bis],11).

The acknowledgment of a separate term *māśôś* II in Job 8:19 and Isa. 8:6 seems text-critically justified, since *māśôś* with the meaning "joy" does not suit the context. In both instances scholars have suggested deriving the term from *mss,* "despair," niphal "melt, become fluid, become weak."[4] Isa. 8:6 uses *māśôś* parallel to *r^eṣîn,* "Rezin (of Damascus)," leading to the suggestion that *māśôś* represented a gloss for *rāṣôn,* though this position has since been abandoned.[5] During the Syro-Ephraimite War, the prophet warns against taking Yahweh's word lightly, which he depicts through the imagery of the gently flowing water of Shiloah, and against kneeling before the "pride" of the Aramean king.

śwś/śyś. G. Braulik, "Die Freude des Festes," *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums. SBAB* 2 (1988), 161-218 = *Theologisches Jahrbuch* (1983) 13-54; P. Humbert, "'Laetari et exultare' dans le vocabulaire religieux de l'AT," *RHPR* 22 (1942) 185-214; J. Ihromi, "Die Häufung der Verben des Jubelns in Zephaniah III 14f., 16-18," *VT* 33 (1983) 106-10; G. Mansfeld, "Der Ruf zur Freude im AT" (diss., Heidelberg, 1965); O. Michel, "Freude," *RAC,* VIII, 348-418; E. Otto and T. Schramm, *Festival and Joy. Biblical Encounter Series* (Eng. trans., Nashville, 1980).

1. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1314a; T. Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strasbourg, 1904), 43.
2. Cf. *HAL,* II, 640b; III, 1363a.
3. Concerning the form *maqṭal,* see *BLe,* §61gζ.
4. *HAL,* II, 606-7.
5. See O. Schroeder, *ZAW* 32 (1912) 301-2.

In Job 8:19 Bildad tells the godforsaken Job that he will not endure and that his life path *(darkô)* will "melt away" *(mss).* "His life's path is at an end, another person will take his place . . . and it will be as if he never existed."[6]

Both passages share the inclination to warn against false trust that is not directed toward Yahweh.[7]

The term *śāśôn* (defectively *śāśōn,* Est. 8:16) occurs 22 times in the MT, then also in Sir. 15:6. Almost half the passages associate it syntactically with *śimḥâ.* The Jeremianic contexts are characterized by the construct expression *qôl śāśôn.* The most remarkable observation is that unlike the other formatives from this root, the occurrences of *śāśôn* date more clearly to the preexilic period, with only one dating to the period of Trito-Isaiah (Isa. 61:3), possibly as an adoption of the terminology of Ps. 45:8(7).

II. Occurrences and Meaning.

1. *The Verb.* The 27 occurrences of the verb are distributed as follows: 9 in Isaiah (cj. in Isa. 42:11 and 64:4[5]), 7 in the Psalms, 4 in Deuteronomy, 2 each in Job and Lamentations, 1 each in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zephaniah; all passages date to the postexilic period and thus allow the classification of this lexeme as one of the late idioms of the Hebrew language. The word field surrounding the notion of joy and jubilation (which Ihromi has assembled for Zeph. 3:14-15) has been gathered from the context of many passages and is frequently characterized by the pleophoric tenor attaching to the parenetic pieces found in the prophetic books and Psalms. Significant terminological shifts can be discerned only through a laborious analysis of details and even then remain semantically unsatisfying with regard to the late OT contexts consistently characterizing the passages using *śwś/śyś,* since one can also observe during this period a significant confluence of the semantic content of many lexemes such as → גיל *gîl,* → הלל *hll,* → ידה *yāḏâ,* → רנן *rānan,* and → שׂמח *śāmaḥ.*

Semantic differentiation based on contrasting terms is also of little help, since the same opposition groups accompany other verbs of joy as well. A development may have taken place from an early, more neutral usage, e.g., of *śāmaḥ* and *śwś/śyś* (cf. Ps. 68:4[3]) to a later, emotional differentiation understanding *śāmaḥ* as the jubilation of one's enemies and *rānan* and *śwś/śyś* as the joy of one's friends (as in Ps. 35:9).

Although the vb. *śwś/śyś* does not seem to be attached to certain subjects in the OT as a whole, individual books possibly exhibit preferences.

a. In the Psalms, which also contain the few preexilic occurrences (Ps. 35:9; 68:4[3]), *śwś/śyś* basically involves only the joy of the righteous (68:4[3]), of those who seek God (40:17[16]; 70:5[4]), those who after long affliction are now jubilant in their assurance of salvation (35:9; cf. Isa. 61:10), those who have learned to appreciate the Torah as a great possession (Ps. 119:14), and finally those who rejoice at God's word "like one who finds great spoil" (119:162).

---

6. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 193.
7. → מאס *mā'as,* VIII, 59 (§ IV).

Ps. 19:6(5), possibly representing an extremely old witness, deviates from this series in its assertion that the sun emerges from its canopy and rejoices like a warrior, an old (Sumerian) motif enhanced by the element of the joy of creation.

A late postexilic addendum to the book of Zephaniah (Zeph. 3:16-20) picks up this motif (v. 17). According to the oracle of salvation for Jerusalem, Yahweh is in its midst, a warrior bringing victory. With four different expressions, the passage then immediately describes how he rejoices *(śwś, śāmaḥ, gîl, rānan)*. This accumulation of statements about the rejoicing God picked up not only on Ps. 19:6(5) but also on various other emergent traditions (see the discussion of Trito-Isaiah below).

b. On the one hand, Deuteronomy uses the vb. *śwś/śyś* to refer only to Yahweh's joy (Dt. 28:63[bis]; 30:9[bis]), expressing the joy of the people and especially their festival joy with *śāmaḥ*.[8] Yahweh "delights" in making his people numerous. Should the people disregard his Torah, he will also "take delight" in tearing them away from their newly acquired possession (28:63). Whereas in this passage the element of joy seems to disperse into a kind of enhanced anticipation, an exilic redactor in Dt. 30:9 picks up the term again but now emphasizes Yahweh's undivided joy with regard to Israel's ancestors, which now articulates itself in Yahweh's present joy with regard to his people.[9]

The ideas of this redactor also influenced the book of Jeremiah, where a postexilic redactor associates the salvific promise of the eternal covenant with the motif of Yahweh's joy, who intends to plant his people anew in his land (Jer. 32:41).

c. Finally, God's joy with regard to his people plays an important role in the prophetic message of Trito-Isaiah. The evidence in the third part of the book of Isaiah (Isa. 56–66) no longer offers as unified a picture, perhaps because of the complicated literary genesis of this book.

Whereas *rnn* occurs with noticeable frequency in Deutero-Isaiah,[10] the terms *śwś* and *gyl* virtually represent two of Trito-Isaiah's favorite words.[11] Isa. 62:5; 65:18,19; 66:10,14 can all be traced back to his hand, as can the use of *māśôś* in 60:15; 62:5; 65:18. He also brought it in the people's lament (63:7–64:11). Finally, a redactor from the second half of the fifth century B.C.E. picked up this vocabulary in a continuation in 61:10.

The text of 64:4(5) is so corrupt that one is best advised to follow the LXX in reading עֹשֵׂי *'śy* instead of שָׂשׂ וְעֹשֵׂה *śś w'śh*,[12] which then eliminates this passage from consideration.

The unknown prophet himself uses this word to refer to the utmost joy. Zion is no longer abandoned or despised, but rather "a joy from age to age" (60:15). It is not wealth, however, that contributes to this effusive accolade; it is rather peace and righteousness that characterize Zion in the salvific period (vv. 17-18). Trito-Isaiah compares God's joy at Zion with the "joy of the bridegroom *(meśôś ḥāṯān)*" (62:5).

8. See in this regard Braulik, 180 n. 75.
9. See N. Lohfink, "Der Bundesschluss im Land Moab," *BZ* 6 (1962) 43 n. 49.
10. See K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 248.
11. See K. Koenen, *Ethik und Eschatologie im Tritojesajabuch: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie. WMANT* 62 (1990), 121 n. 374.
12. Cf. *BHS; HAL*, III, 1314b.

In his response to the great lament of the people in 63:7–64:11(12), the prophet first examines the fate of the various groups of people in postexilic Israel, then focuses on the new age after the people have turned away from idolatry. It is then that they will be glad *(śwś)* and rejoice *(gyl)* forever at what Yahweh has created, for he will create Jerusalem "as a joy" *(gîlâ)* and its people as a "delight" (*māśôś*, 65:18).[13] Yahweh's own joy at this Jerusalem parallels that of the people: "I will rejoice *(gyl)* in Jerusalem, and delight *(śwś)* in my people" (v. 19). A later redactor picks up this creation joy announced by Trito-Isaiah but now restricts it to Yahweh's servants (vv. 13-14; instead of *śwś* and *gyl*, the redactor now uses *śāmaḥ* and *rnn*), evidence of a clear polarization within the postexilic community.

In an artistically composed oracle of salvation (66:10-14a) in which the promise of rejoicing (*śāś*, v. 14a) constitutes an inclusio with the summons to rejoice (*śîśû . . . māśôś*, v. 10b), Trito-Isaiah announces the end of the time of sorrow and the beginning of the time of joy. The Trito-Isaianic message of the joy of creation characterizing the salvific age now comes to expression in the image of mother Zion who gives birth and nurses.

In the middle of a comprehensive proclamation of the glory of the future Zion (60:1–62:12), the redactor has inserted a Zion hymn of joy at Yahweh's salvific acts skillfully connecting the two parts of the text, 61:1-9 and 62, by using the terminology of joy (cf. 60:3,7, and 62:5): "I will greatly rejoice *(śôś 'āśîś)* in Yahweh, my whole being shall exult *(tāg̱ēl)* in my God" (61:10).

Hence one can view *śwś* and *māśôś* as programmatic terms within Trito-Isaiah, whose work contains nearly a fifth of all occurrences. He proclaims God's new creation, which itself introduces the new salvific period with accompanying joy and jubilation — a motif unmistakably contrasting the actual situation of the postexilic community.

d. Isa. 35:1 plays an interesting role; like Isa. 35 as a whole, it belongs to the "larger Isaianic redaction" of a first and second book of Isaiah and thus dates to the later period of the Diadochi.[14] Commensurate with the connective redactional techniques employed here, the statement, "The wilderness and the dry land shall be glad, the desert shall rejoice and blossom,"[15] is to be understood in connection first with 42:11, "Let the desert and its towns rejoice,"[16] and second with 33:9, with the contrasting motif of "grief" *('āḇal 'umlᵉlâ)*. The word field of joy concurs in the use of *śwś/śyś* and *rnn*. The redactor, however, alters the salient proclamation terminology of Isa. 35:1 (*hll, yrd*

13. On the text-critical problems of this passage see Koenen, 171 n. 75.

14. See O. H. Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr. Jesaja 35 als redaktionelle Brücke zwischen dem Ersten und dem Zweiten Jesaja. SBS* 121 (1985), 101ff.

15. On the peculiar form *yᵉśuśûm* (the final *mem* representing dittography with the following *miḏbār*), see *BLe*, 405; a different position is taken by H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. trans. 2002), 341, who identifies it as an assimilated *nyn-paragogicum;* additional discussion in M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 400.

16. Instead of *yiś'û*, one should follow LXX *(euphraínein)* and read *yāśuś* (according to 1QIsaᵃ, *yś'*, this passage involves a graphic variant, albeit one supporting reading the sg.).

hiphil, *ngd* hiphil) to fit the context of creation theology and instead uses *gîl,* "rejoice," and *pāraḥ,* "blossom," an alteration that does bring him closer to Deutero-Isaiah.[17]

This salvific proclamation foretells a transformation of nature that will have a miraculous effect on human beings (vv. 5-6) in that they will now behold the *kᵉḇôḏ yhwh* (v. 2).

e. Both occurrences of the verb in Lam. 1:21 and 4:21 refer to the joy of Jerusalem's victorious enemies. Lam. 1 possibly contains the lyrics of a worship service of lament in the face of the destruction of Jerusalem in 587, a service characterized by elements of cultic drama. Quite commensurate with the genre, the singer offers an entire compendium of the vocabulary of lamentation: "sitting lonely" (v. 1), "weeping" (vv. 2,16), "finding no resting place" (v. 3), "grieving, groaning" (vv. 4,8,21), "being desolate, crying aloud" (vv. 4,18), "having none to comfort" (vv. 9,21), all of which is sharply contrasted with the triumph of Jerusalem's enemies, who have become the masters (v. 5), mock her (v. 7), and triumph (*higdîl,* v. 9). The lament culminates in vv. 20ff.: Jerusalem's stomach churns, the city groans *('ānaḥ),* with no one to comfort her while her enemies rejoice at her troubles *(śāśû).*

Lam. 4:21 introduces an oracle of salvation for Edom(!), which is summoned to "rejoice and be glad." In reality, however, this oracle is ironically announcing the divine judgment upon Edom for its hostile behavior toward Judah.

f. Textual criticism already burdens Ezk. 21:15 with insoluble problems, particularly since neither the MT nor the early versions offer any useful solutions. The salient point is that the reference to a rod *(šēḇeṭ)* is logically incoherent within the context of the Song of the Sword, suggesting that vv. 15b and 18 represent later insertions. Here "it then remains quite uncertain whether the additions in vv 15b and 18 really should be interpreted from the context, or whether they contain quite independent remarks introduced from the outside."[18] According to the MT, a wisdom speaker may have understood Ezekiel's statement regarding the existence of the threat (the "sword") and its power pedagogically, then ultimately compared the threat to Israel with the rod of a teacher. This understanding could have reinterpreted the threatening statements of the Song of the Sword in the sense of postexilic prophecy, suggesting that this judgment will not necessarily be a final one, but constitute rather a pedagogical transition to salvation. But does such a perspective offer reason enough for joy (*'ô nāśîś,* v. 15b)?

g. The two passages in the book of Job mention a completely different kind of joy. In his first discourse Job, in the face of unbearable suffering, points to the joy *(śmḥ)* of those who find a pile of stones[19] and the rejoicing *(śwś)* of those who find a grave for themselves (Job 3:22). Here the notion of joy clearly takes on the aspect of "yearning."

Finally, in Job 39:21 (divine discourse), it is the warhorse that stamps "joyously" with its hooves in anticipation of doing battle with the enemy.

17. Contra Wildberger, 348.
18. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 427.
19. On the text see F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (⁴1983), 38; Fohrer, 112.

2. *The Noun māśôś.* Hosea is the first to use the noun *māśôś,* here in an oracle of woe against idolatrous Israel, whose apostasy to Ba'al will result in painful deprivations in its quality of life (Hos. 2:10-15[8-13]). Yahweh will put an end to everything Israel thinks it owes to Ba'al, and certainly to the *māśôś,* the joy of the orgiastic cult of Ba'al, the festivals *(ḥag),* the new moons *(ḥōḏeš),* Sabbaths *(šabbāṯ),* and assemblies (*mô'ēḏ,* v. 13). Israel will become completely incapable of cultic participation and will eat the "bread of mourning" *(leḥem 'ônîm),* which will make it unclean (9:4).

In an oracle of woe against the careless women immediately before the destruction of Jerusalem, the prophet summons them to lament the "joyous houses" *(bāttê māśôś),* the "jubilant city" *(qiryâ 'allîzâ)* (Isa. 32:13), since they will become a wasteland, the "joy of wild asses" (*meśôś perā'îm,* v. 14). The end of the joy surrounding Jerusalem becomes a widespread motif of lament (Lam. 5:15); the joyous sound of the timbrels *(meśôś tuppîm)* and lyre *(meśôś kinnôr)* falls silent (Isa. 24:8); the "gladness of the earth" *(meśôś hā'āreṣ)* is banished (v. 11).

These late laments reverse an extremely widespread motif of jubilation of the preexilic period. Ps. 48:3(2) already praises Mt. Zion as *meśôś kol-hā'āreṣ,* the "joy of all the earth," a designation Lam. 2:15 explicitly cites and enhances with the attribute "perfection of beauty" *(kelîlaṯ yōpî).* Ezekiel calls Jerusalem the "stronghold" *(mā'ôz)* of its inhabitants, the "joy of their glory" *(meśôś tip'artām),* the "delight of their eyes" *(maḥmaḏ 'ênêhem),* and the "affection of their heart" *(maśśā' napšām)* (Ezk. 24:25).

Trito-Isaiah broadly develops this motif within the framework of his own Zion theology. For him Zion is the "joy from age to age" (Isa. 60:15; 65:18); God himself rejoices as does a bridegroom at his bride (62:5; see discussion above). Everyone should be glad (*śāmaḥ)* and rejoice *(gyl)* at Jerusalem; all who mourn over Jerusalem (*'bl* hithpael) will greatly rejoice (*śwś māśôś,* 66:10).

Jer. 49:25 calls Damascus, which was once a celebrated city, a "city of joy" (*qiryaṯ māśôś;* cf. *BHS*). This designation is based on the inhabitants' pride in the strong fortifications, which cannot, however, protect the city from Yahweh's judgment.

3. *The Noun śāśôn.* In an oracle against Jerusalem (ca. 701), Isaiah uses the word *śāśôn* par. *śimḥâ* to reproach the unrepentant behavior of Jerusalem's inhabitants. In a hedonistic, eschatological, carefree, and gluttonous mood, the Jerusalemites joyfully resist the prophet's summons to weep, lament, shave their heads, and wear the *śaq* (Isa. 22:12-13). This antithetical position clearly identifies *śāśôn* par. *śimḥâ* as a contrasting notion over against the rites of self-humiliation. According to Ps. 119:14 (see above), Jeremiah's confession can be viewed as virtually a unique position according to which Yahweh's word actually represents *śāśôn* and a delight of the heart *(śimḥaṯ lēḇāḇ)* for him (Jer. 15:16). The term *śwś* or its derivatives do not otherwise occur in connection with Yahweh's word or torah.

Ps. 45:8(7) dates to an indefinite period during the monarchy. A song celebrating the king's wedding recalls the king's anointing: "You love righteousness and hate wickedness. Therefore God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness." The

word combination *šemen śāśôn* recalls the festive act of anointing expressing joy.[20] Trito-Isaiah, who otherwise does not use *śāśôn,* uses this term but once in his Zion predications (Isa. 61:3), otherwise preferring *māśôś* (see above).

The threat of a reversal of joy into mourning was frequently expressed during the preexilic period. During the exilic and postexilic period, this threat "tips over" into a salvific statement and as such becomes a fixed part of the formulae anticipating the homecoming and extolling the new Jerusalem, especially in the Dtr continuations in the book of Jeremiah. Cries of jubilation and joy (*qôl śāśôn wᵉqôl śimḥâ,* Jer. 7:34; 16:9; 25:10; 33:11; concerning the motif of the joy of the bridegroom, cf. Isa. 62:5) will once again be heard in the deserted streets of Jerusalem. Dancing, gaiety, and jubilation characterize the returnees (Jer. 31:13).

The exodus from Egypt and the return from exile fill the people with joy and jubilation. Events of the wilderness wanderings are recalled, such as the water flowing from rock (Ps. 105:43; cf. Ex. 17:6). A late postexilic redactor may also recall this motif when in a song of thanksgiving he assures those who are delivered that "with joy *(bᵉśāśôn)* you will draw water from the wells of salvation" (Isa. 12:3; although H. Wildberger postulates the presence of a sacramental rite involving "drawing water before Yahweh," such is not attested in the OT[21]).

Deutero-Isaiah also anticipates that the return home will be characterized by joy, gladness, and song (Isa. 51:3). The prophet does not, however, view this new situation as merely temporary, but rather as the commencement of the messianic salvific age that will be characterized by rejoicing, gladness, and joy, now perceived as "everlasting joy" (*śimḥat ʿôlām,* 51:11; picked up again by a postexilic redactor in 35:10). This "new Jerusalem" will become a "joy" for Yahweh (instead of the indefinite *wᵉhāyᵉṯâ llî lᵉšēm śāśôn,* "and it[?] shall be to me a name of joy" [MT], read with *BHS* et al. *yᵉrûšālayim lᵉśāśôn*) and a "glory before all the nations of the earth" (Jer. 33:9), a "Jewish idea reflecting late postexilic universalism."[22]

Zechariah's query concerning true fasting similarly stands in the context of the new Jerusalem (Zech. 7:3). If accompanied by righteousness, social consciousness, and a peaceful heart, fasting will indeed be a season of joy *(śāśôn)* and gladness *(śimḥâ)* (8:19), and the days of fasting will become cheerful festivals *(mōʿᵃḏîm ṭôḇîm).*

In an extremely late summons to lament within a penitential celebration associated with a locust plague, Joel picks up motifs from the traditional literature of lament. Like the trees in the field, so also "joy among the people" has withered (Joel 1:12). Finally, the postexilic petitioner in Ps. 51 turns to Yahweh and asks, "let me hear joy and gladness . . . restore to me the joy of your salvation" (51:10,14[8,12]). Here *śāśôn* refers unmistakably to salvific joy, joy at liberation and deliverance. This semantic valence characterizes the latest witnesses as well. In Est. 8:15ff. *śāśôn* refers to the Jews' own

20. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), in loc.
21. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 505-6.
22. See W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 198.

joy at being delivered by the decree of Artaxerxes, joy that has come to characterize the carefree and joyous celebration of Purim.

III. 1. *Sirach.* The root *śwś* occurs only 4 times in Hebrew Sirach. In 39:31 God designates the forces of nature to carry out his bidding. They rejoice *(yśyśw)* when their call comes. According to 15:6, wisdom enables a person to find gladness *(śāśôn)* and rejoicing *(śimḥâ)* and bestows everlasting fame. A summary of regulations concerning proper sacrifice (34:21–35:22) encourages the person to show a cheerful face at every offering and good work and to dedicate tithes "with gladness" *(bᵉśāśôn)* (35[32]:11]; cf. Mt. 6:1-4 and 2 Cor. 9:7). A collection of rules for dining cannot do without an admonition to partake of wine only in moderation: "Wine drunk at the proper time and in moderation is rejoicing of heart and gladness of soul. Wine drunk to excess leads to bitterness of spirit, to quarrels and stumbling" (Sir. 31[34]:28).

2. *LXX.* The LXX uses a whole panoply of words to translate *śwś.* The most frequent is *euphraínesthai* (9 times), which otherwise generally renders *śāmaḥ* and in Trito-Isaiah *rnn,* and *euphrosýnē* (twice), both noticeably restricted to occurrences in Isaiah and Deuteronomy. The LXX similarly renders all occurrences in Sirach with this Greek root. It translates the occurrences in the Psalms with *agalliásthai* (4 times) and *térpein* (3 times). In the Psalms the former usually renders *gîl,* the latter *rnn.* The vb. *chaírein* (4 times) translates the two occurrences each in Isa. 66 and Lamentations. The terms *episképein, gaurián,* and *epágein* occur once each. The concentration of individual translation terms in certain books is less the result of any conscious drawing of distinctions than an indication of still unresolved translation problems in the LXX itself.[23]

The evidence is similarly opaque in the translation of *māśôś.* The LXX uses *euphrosýnē* 8 times, *euphraínesthai* once, again concentrated in Isaiah. It also uses *chará* (twice), and *agallíama* and *éparsis* (once each).

It translates *śāśôn* as *euphrosýnē* (10 times, also 3 times in Sirach) in Isaiah and Jeremiah, and as *agallíasis* in the Psalms (4 times). It also uses *chará* (5 times), *agallíama* (3 times), *aínesis,* and *charmonḗ* (once each).

3. *Qumran.* This root occurs only rarely in Qumran, which is surprising given the broad attestation of other terminology associated with joy and jubilation. It is similarly surprising that *śwś* and its derivatives are not attested in liturgical texts (e.g., Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice). The Qumran Essenes were familiar with this term and employed it as an appropriate expression of their joy in their status as God's elect and in God's salvation and aid (1QM 13:13). This joy is a fundamental characteristic of the new age in which the community believes itself to be living. The covenant and truth are reason for joy and gladness (1QH 10:30). The petitioner knows that in the community he is under God's protection and can rejoice despite temptation and rebukes (1QH 9:24). Finally,

---

23. Cf. already R. Bultmann, "εὐφραίνω, εὐφροσύνη," *TDNT,* II, 773; H. Conzelmann, "χαίρω, κτλ.," *TDNT,* IX, 362-63.

the joy at the new Zion comes to expression in an interesting adoption of Trito-Isaianic motifs in the Zion apostrophe (11QPs[a] 22:1-15). The object of joy is the fullness of its *kāḇôḏ* (l. 4; with *śmḥ* in l. 15). The root does not otherwise occur in the texts concerning the "new Jerusalem" among the Qumran writings.

Fabry

צָחַק/שָׂחַק *śāḥaq/ṣāḥaq;* צְחֹק/שְׂחוֹק *śeḥôq/ṣeḥōq;* מִשְׂחָק *miśḥāq;* יִצְחָק/יִשְׂחָק *yiśḥāq/yiṣḥāq*

Contents: I. General Considerations: 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Meaning; 4. Semantic Field. II. OT Usage: 1. *śāḥaq/ṣāḥaq (miśḥāq);* 2. *śeḥôq/ṣeḥōq.* III. Use Outside the Hebrew OT: 1. LXX; 2. Sirach and Qumran.

I. General Considerations.

1. *Etymology.* Although the Proto-Semitic root **dḥk* is frequently adduced as the etymological background of the synonymous Hebrew roots *śḥq/ṣḥq,*[1] in the meantime one seems better advised to start with a West Semitic biconsonantal root **ḥq,* which in various languages has been influenced by the systematic drive toward triconsonantalism to add a prothetic element that differs from case to case (concerning this phenomenon, see the more recent discussion concerning the Hebrew roots *hlk* and *lqḥ*), though a certain degree of mutual influence may doubtless be at work in the choice of that particular prothetic element. One phenomenon observed by scholars is that the first radical of the root can not only vary in Hebrew, but has also proven to be less stable in other West Semitic languages and can vary considerably among the different languages in this group (or even be absent altogether), whereas the other two radicals (excepting the following dialect variants *q/k* and *ḥ/h* deriving from usual sound shifts) are stable.

In any event, this phenomenon can be more easily explained by the assumption of a secondarily added prothetic element than by the assumption of an originally tricon-

---

śāḥaq/ṣāḥaq. M. D. Goldman, "Humour in the Hebrew Bible," *ABR* 2 (1952) 2-11; E. M. Good, *Irony in the OT* (Sheffield, ²1981); M. I. Gruber, "Ten Dance-Derived Expressions in the Hebrew Bible," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 328-46, esp. 345; F. F. Hvidberg, *Weeping and Laughter in the OT: A Study of Canaanite-Israelite Religion* (Leiden, 1962); O. Keel, *Die Weisheit spielt vor Gott. Ein ikonographischer Beitrag zur Deutung des meṣaḥäqät in Spr 8,30f.* (Freiburg/Göttingen, 1974); M. Moreshet, "צחק — שחק. יצחק — ישחק," *BethM* 13 (1968/69) 127-30; 15 (1969/70) 105-6; H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971), esp. 108-11, 146-51; C. W. Reines, "Laughter in Biblical and Rabbinic Literature," *Judaism* 21 (1972) 176-83; W. Vischer, "Der im Himmel Thronende lacht," *Freude am Evangelium. FS A. de Quervain. BEvT* 44 (1966), 129-35; R. Voeltzel, *Das Lachen des Herrn. Über Ironie in der Bibel. Theologische Forschung* 17 (1961).

1. See Beyer, 584.

sonantal root. Such is suggested not least by the semantic observation that the given sounds are fully adequate for the onomatopoeic expression of laughing, which is unmistakably the intention here, whereas a triconsonantal construction would rather conceal this phenomenon. Considered physiologically, laughing does, after all, occur when the diaphragm presses air out in gasps through the mouth cavity, generating short, monosyllabic sounds (cf., e.g., the expression "ha-ha" or the similarly onomatopoeic verbs "giggle, cackle"). On the other hand, the assumption of an originally triconsonantal root would involve an excessively complicated process of progressive assimilation or dissimilation and/or metathesis involving some element in the root that bears the meaning of the verb, whereas such variations can be more easily explained in the case of a subsequently accrued element, i.e., an element that does not bear the meaning, especially since in that case the demonstration of genetic connections between the individual formations of the root is no longer necessary. The earlier hypothesis assumes that Akk. *dḥk* would have lost its *q/k* and changed *ḥ* to *ḫ*, resulting in *ṣiāḫu/ṣâḫu*, while in the West Semitic languages the same root would have variously changed phonetically to such differing consonantal sequences as *ṣḥq/śḥq/šḥq/dḥk/gḥk/ʿḥk/ḥʿk/ḥʾk/hʾk/ḥwk.*[2] The etymology of Akk. *ṣiāḫu/ṣâḫu* has in the meantime been more cogently associated with West Semitic *ṣḥ/ṣwḥ*, "cry out,"[3] whereas in the other languages the etymological interpretation of the lexemes for "laugh" has no problems deriving the various terms from a genuinely West Semitic onomatopoeia **ḥq*. From this perspective the dispute among Hebraists regarding whether the original form of the root was *ṣḥq* or *śḥq* is not only not particularly relevant,[4] but given the difficulties dating the individual texts it is probably also insoluble.[5] In all related languages the noun derivatives belong largely to the same semantic field as the verbal root and refer not only to "laughing, laughter," but also to accompanying ideas such as "mockery."

Concrete occurrences outside the OT and the Hebrew Qumran texts include Arab. *ḍaḥika*, "laugh"; Eth. *šaḥaqa/šĕḥĕqa*, "laugh"; *mĕšḥâq*, "place of laughter," i.e., "theater"; Hatra (?) *sḥq;* Jewish Aram. *geḥak̲, deḥak̲, ḥûk̲*, "laugh"; Mand. *ahk* and *ghk*, "laugh"; Qumran Aram. *ḥʾk, ḥʿk, hʾk*, "laugh"; Syr. *geḥēk*, "laugh"; Ugar. *ṣḥq/ẓḥq*, "laugh," and *dḥk* in a Persian-Aramaic glossary.[6] The Akkadian term *šaḫāqu* cited in *HAL* (which reads *šeḫēqu*) cannot really be viewed as an immediate etymological par-

---

2. Concerning this theory see *VG*, I, 156, 238-42, who did not yet, however, have the Akkadian or Qumran evidence; or Beyer, 584.

3. K. R. Veenhof, "An Old Accadian Private Letter," *JEOL* 24 (1975/76) 109, contra *HAL*, III, 1019, and *AHw*, III, 1096.

4. Cf. *GesB*, 781; also *HAL*, III, 1315b.

5. See 2 below.

6. For Arabic: Wehr, 535-36; for Ethiopic: *LexLingAeth*, 234; for Hatra, R. Degen, "New Inscriptions from Hatra (Nos. 231-280)," *JEOL* 23 (1973/74, 1975) 405; for Jewish Aramaic: *HAL*, II, 1019b, incorrectly *geḥaq;* also *ANH*, 76, 94, 139; *WTM*, I, 321, 389; II, 22; for Mandaic: *MdD*, 9, 81; for Qumran Aramaic: Beyer, 584; for Syriac: *LexSyr*, 113; for Ugaritic: M. J. Dahood, *RSP*, I, 320, no. 477; *UT*, nos. 1049, 2158; *WUS*, nos. 2314, 2370; for Persian Aramaic: *DNSI*, I, 244.

allel, though it may well attest that certain physiological processes were articulated with onomatopoeic verbs in the Semitic sphere.[7]

2. *Occurrences.* The synonymous roots *śḥq/ṣḥq* occur altogether 179 times in the Hebrew part of the OT; neither these nor related roots occur in the Aramaic portions. Of the 179 Hebrew occurrences, 49 are verb forms (36 times *śḥq,* 13 times *ṣḥq*), with qal and piel forms occurring with equal frequency (for *śḥq* in a relationship see 18:17, for *ṣḥq* see 6:7), though one should remember that except for the noticeably frequent occurrence of participles (14 times), where the prefixed *m* signals the piel, the Masoretic interpretation does not necessarily reflect the intentions of the ancient authors.[8] The hiphil of *śḥq* also occurs once. Among the noun constructions, the PN Isaac predominates with 112 occurrences (108 times as *yiṣḥāq,* 4 as *yiśḥāq*), whereas the other noun forms occur only rarely (*śᵉḥôq* 15 times, *ṣᵉḥōq* twice, *miśḥāq* once). Because some of the occurrences of the first two nouns can also be construed as construct infinitives — which the forms of these lexemes are, after all — ultimately one cannot delineate unequivocally between the noun and verb constructions. Nonetheless, a comparison of more recent lexicons and concordances shows that scholarship essentially disagrees only with regard to the classification of *śᵉḥôq* in Jgs. 16:27.

As far as the distribution of occurrences in the various OT books is concerned, one notices first that *ṣḥq* and its derivative *ṣᵉḥōq* occur almost exclusively in Genesis, doubtless because popular etymology considered this phonetic variant of the root to be closely related to the name of the patriarch Isaac, who is mentioned here exclusively with the orthography *yiṣḥāq* (80 times), tempting one to trace the existence of the phonetic variant *ṣḥq* back to the need to explain the name "Isaac" etymologically or etiologically. As the three exceptions (Ex. 32:6; Jgs. 16:25; Ezk. 23:32) show, however, this assumption leads one astray, since none of these three passages focuses even remotely on Isaac. An explanation of the phenomenon by way of possible diachronic speculation is also of little help because, in the first place, the occurrences of the PN *yiṣḥāq* are found in all the sources or redactional strata of the Pentateuch, just as on the other hand the four occurrences of the form *yiśḥāq* are also found in texts of varying temporal origin and (as Jer. 33:26 and Ps. 105:9 make clear when compared to Am. 7:9,16) cannot be explained by way of possible accommodation to a parallel *yiśrā'ēl;* in the second place, the alternation between *ṣḥq* and *śḥq* in Jgs. 16:25ff. demonstrates the synchronic exchangeability of the two variants with sufficient clarity. To that extent, E. Jenni's suggestion also fails to offer a convincing hypothesis,[9] namely, that after Jgs. 16:25 *śḥq* replaces *ṣḥq,* for his observations refer only to the verbal forms, not to *ṣᵉḥōq* (Ezk. 23:32) and the orthography of the name Isaac, where — if at all — one would primarily expect a secondary systematization to be carried through during the canonization of these texts. Not even in the case of the sequence Abraham-Isaac-Jacob

7. *HAL,* III, 1315b; *AHw,* III, 1209.
8. See III.1 below.
9. *HP,* 155.

(Israel), which was, after all, of fundamental significance in determining Israel's identity, did the authors establish any orthographic consistency; Jer. 33:26 and Ps. 105:9-10 use the orthography *yiśḥāq,* the other passages *yiṣḥāq,* and do so regardless of whether the sequence is continued with Jacob or Israel (cf. the series with Israel in Ex. 32:13; 1 K. 18:36; 1 Ch. 29:18; 2 Ch. 30:6 with the discernible "normal form" with Jacob after Gen. 50:24).

As far as the variant *śḥq* and its derivatives (except *yiśḥāq*) are concerned, one notices a concentration of occurrences in wisdom literature; nearly half the total occurrences (24 of 52) are found in the books of Job (11 times), Proverbs (8), and Ecclesiastes (5), doubtless because, more than other OT texts, wisdom writings were particularly interested in human beings and their disposition. A relative concentration is also discernible in Jeremiah (7 times) and the Psalms (6), though one must consider that of the latter, two (Ps. 37:13; 104:26) are found in psalms clearly influenced by the wisdom tradition and thus for all practical purposes should be assigned to that group.

By contrast, it is certainly more than conspicuous that *śḥq/ṣḥq* rarely occur in the historical books from Joshua through 2 Kings, and that the authors never speak of "laughing" even in contexts comparable to Homer or Hesiod or, to a certain extent, even to the Baʿal-ʿAnat cycle and the Aqhat legend,[10] where the latter authors did indeed feel it appropriate to mention a kind of "Homeric" laughter. 1 S. 18:7 might constitute an exception in this regard. The anthropological and theological understanding of the Yahweh religion in its Dtr version seems to have asserted itself here completely.

3. *Meaning.* The basic qal meaning of the synonyms *śḥq/ṣḥq,* which semantically are to be reckoned among the onomatopoeic verbs, is "laugh," formulated abstractly: "express a loose, relaxed emotional disposition through nonverbal sounds." (Concerning this abstract definition, cf. Jgs. 16:25, which explicitly mentions the loose, relaxed disposition of the Philistines as the presupposition of laughing; we can leave open the question whether the two forms *wyśḥq* or *wyṣḥq* there are to be vocalized as qal or with the Masora as piel.[11]) These terms thus represent intransitive verbs from the broader classification of the *verba stativa,* something confirmed by the fact that the verbs are never found with direct objects.

It should be pointed out that scholars oriented more toward theology than philology frequently emphasize the aspect of "superiority" allegedly expressed in the act of laughing even though this aspect by no means inheres in the basic meaning and can only sometimes be deduced contextually, in which case generally the preps. *lᵉ* and *ʿal* are used with *śḥq/ṣḥq.*[12] Laughing as a naive, cheerful expression of a positive feeling for life, though also as an expression of helplessness, is anything but alien to the OT.

---

10. *KTU* 1.4; 1.8; 1.17-22; *ANET,* 131ff., 149ff.

11. See in this regard the discussion below and II.1.

12. So, e.g., B. Reicke, "Lachen," *BHHW,* II, 1035; K. H. Rengstorf, "γελάω," *TDNT,* I, 658-59; A. Richardson, *A Theological Word Book of the Bible* (New York, 1950), 122, excludes in principle even the possibility that laughing in the Bible could have anything to do with "amusement."

Even where an author speaks of God's own *śḥq* (Ps. 2:4; 37:13; 59:9[Eng. 8]), the idea of "superiority" emerges not from the lexeme *śḥq* itself, but from its association with *lᵉ* and from the context.

To that extent and even assuming God as the subject, one cannot *automatically* associate the idea of superiority with the use of the lexeme in Ps. 104:26 (and in the piel there);[13] in its incorporation of the originally Canaanite Jerusalem sanctuary, the Yahweh religion also adopted features of the beneficent high god El, who laughs and jokes in ways expressing far more than merely his divine superiority.[14]

Moreover, precisely in passages using no prepositional object, such as Jgs. 16:27; Prov. 29:9; Eccl. 3:4, it is highly advisable to dispense with the widespread theological overburdening of *śḥq/ṣḥq* and to understand the prevailing emotional lightheartedness expressed in "laughing" as deriving from the context alone rather than from the lexeme "in and for itself." Something similar applies to the noun forms deriving from the qal, *śᵉḥôq, ṣᵉḥōq,* and *miśḥāq*. The mere lexeme itself does not express anything beyond the kind of relaxed emotional disposition attaching to all laughing, as is made clear by passages such as Eccl. 7:3; 10:19. If this emotional disposition is indeed accompanied by a feeling of superiority, that feeling emerges from the context, not from the lexeme *śᵉḥôq* etc., as, e.g., in Jer. 48:39; Lam. 3:14; Hab. 1:10.[15]

Jenni has accurately defined the basic meaning of the root in the piel as a "cheerful *activity* consisting of different, varying, and sequential individual actions" (my emphasis).[16] Two observations can amplify and complement this observation. First, one notices that even in the piel, the synonyms *śḥq/ṣḥq* never take a direct object; i.e., contrary to expectation, even in the piel as the "most active" verbal form the basic intransitive character of the roots does not recede, at least not as long as it is relativized by prepositional phrases (which in Hebrew replace the Indo-European *verba composita*) in the sense of "laughing at" or "smiling at." Second, the participle, which characterizes durative action, claims a disproportionate number of the verb forms here (14 of 24 occurrences, i.e., about 58 percent over against an average of 10 percent),[17] findings commensurate with Jenni's emphasis on a sequence of individual actions. Jenni did not, however, examine the possibility that, considering the intransitive character of the two roots, the piel of *śḥq/ṣḥq* might also be meant factitively, a possibility he otherwise regularly considers and that would certainly suit Jgs. 16:25a. Gen. 17:17-

---

13. Concerning the subject, see II.1 below; concerning the notion of superiority, see, e.g., S. Grill, "Textkritische Notizen: Ps 104,26; Ps 77,11," *BZ* 3 (1959) 102.

14. Cf. in this regard Hvidberg, 15-49, 57, 146-54, etc., who does, however, overemphasize the cultic element; and Vischer, 130; both view this anthropomorphic element in the portrayal of El as an apologetic contrast to the OT understanding of God because they are not considering Ps. 104:26, where they apparently understand Leviathan to be the subject of the piel of *śḥq*.

15. Concerning the overall problem, cf. Reines's detailed analysis of the various aspects of laughing from the Jewish-rabbinic perspective.

16. *HP,* 156.

17. Cf. in this regard, R. Bartelmus, *Hyh: Bedeutung und Funktion einer hebräischen 'Allerweltswortes.' ATS* 17 (1982), 82.

19; 18:9-15; and 21:6ab already provide differing interpretations of the PN *yiṣḥāq (yiśḥāq),* initiating a lengthy discussion still unresolved today.

In these inner-OT interpretations of the name, context determines the results such that at least three corresponding interpretations emerge: the name allegedly derives from the father's or mother's incredulous laughing at the announcement of the birth (Gen. 17:17; 18:12,15), from the mother's grateful laughing after the birth (21:6a), or from the laughing of those mocking the late birth (21:6b). At most, only conservative scholarship still views these purely associative etymologies as serious possibilities. The interpretation "God has brought laughter for me" (21:6a) cannot be reconciled with the temporal function of the verb form on which the name is based, and the authors of the remaining passages make even less effort to do justice to the name in its syntactic structure. By contrast, interpretations that are at least open to philological discussion include those starting in a general sense with the birth situation itself and interpreting the name accordingly as "he/it laughs/begins to laugh" or focusing on the father's smile when he sees the newborn child.[18]

Following Noth, however, scholars generally assume that a theophoric element *(-'ēl)* originally stood at the end of the name and later disappeared.[19] This position then yields two more basic positions, one taking the basic (qal) stem as its point of departure and one presupposing a factitive meaning of the piel and concurring at least substantively with the interpretation of Gen. 21:6a. Accordingly, the name means either that God/El (regularly) brings or should bring about laughing, or that God/El himself is wont to laugh or — as a sign of favor — to smile/laugh over the newborn child. Both the vocalization of the name, which in its own turn presupposes the qal stem as its semantic basis, and the widespread phenomenon of the "wish name" suggest that the latter meaning is most likely, at least relatively speaking. Nonetheless, one cannot exclude the possibility that intentional polyvalences attach to the name, e.g., between the above meanings; these polyvalences are linguistically fixed by the choice of the ambivalent verb form itself and are evident, for example, in the three possibilities mentioned above.[20]

4. *Semantic Field.* The term → לעג *l'g,* "mock," often parallels *śḥq,* a situation occasionally interpreted as indicating synonymity. The texts themselves, however, clearly show that these word fields only partially overlap in certain contexts[21] but do not indicate true synonymity. These findings are also demonstrated unequivocally by texts using *śḥq/ṣḥq* but never *l'g* antithetically with → בכה *bkh,* "weep" (cf. Eccl. 3:4), and by the fact that as far as the nouns are concerned, *śᵉḥôq,* "laugh," occurs as the antithesis of *ka'as,* "sorrow, grief" (Eccl. 7:3), which would hardly be possible if *śᵉḥôq* were se-

18. Cf. in this regard E. A. Speiser, *Genesis. AB* 1 (1964), 122-27, esp. 125; C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. trans. 1985), 269.

19. *IPN,* 210.

20. Concerning this overall problem, see J. J. Stamm, "Der Name Isaak," *Das Wort sie sollen lassen stahn. FS A. Schädlein* (Bern, 1950), 33-38.

21. See II.1 and 2 below.

mantically identical to *la'ag*. To the extent that *śḥq* parallels *l'g*, it also relates to *qls* hithpael, "make fun of something" (Hab. 1:10), and → בוז/בזה *bûz/bāzâ*, "have a low opinion of" (Job 12:4-5), and → חרף *ḥrp*, "revile" (Jer. 20:7-8). Finally, the broader semantic field also includes → שׂמח *śmḥ*, "be glad, rejoice."

II. OT Usage.

1. *śāḥaq/ṣāḥaq (miśḥāq)*. The passages using *śāḥaq/ṣāḥaq* in the qal can be classified formally into those using the verb absolutely and those using the verb with prepositions. As far as content is concerned, one must also, as indicated earlier, distinguish within the passages using prepositions between those in which the prepositions function purely as circumstance qualifiers and those in which the prepositions provide prepositional objects, i.e., where one must assume the presence of a kind of substitutionary construction replacing the *verba composita*, which Hebrew lacks.

With the exception of Gen. 18:12 and 21:6, the first group includes all passages attesting the qal of the variant *ṣāḥaq* (though Gen. 18:12 must nonetheless also be addressed here, since it includes only a circumstance qualifier, namely, regarding how Sarah laughed), along with three passages with *śāḥaq* (Jgs. 16:27; Prov. 29:9; Eccl. 3:4). In a sense Eccl. 3:4 uses the verb as the "concept as such." Viewed formally, this "*mashal* regarding the right time" is nothing more than a series of thirty statements regarding life organized according to the principle of semantic antithesis with the subject "the (right) time" and a prepositional group with l^e indicating the goal or purpose of this time. Neither a subject nor any other element appears that might modify the basic meaning in any fashion. What "laughing" is emerges only from its antithetical nature to "weeping," and Qoheleth as a realistic theologian or anthropologist finds that human life includes an (appropriate) time for both laughing and weeping just as it does for loving and hating, for planting and plucking up, etc. Laughing is viewed simply as an elementary part of human behavior; Qoheleth is not interested (here) in why one may laugh or weep at any given time.

Returning now from this rather sober perspective to the passages in Gen. 17:17; 18:12,13,15(bis), one instinctively asks how despite the lack of any (prepositional) object exegetes can know that Abraham and Sarah are in fact laughing at Yahweh[22] and by means of such laughing thus expressed their (seeming) superiority, their embarrassment, etc. In clear contrast to such psychological speculation, the texts themselves leave open the question regarding what motivates the laughter. Even 18:13, which asks explicitly, "Why did Sarah laugh?" consciously leaves an empty space, and the text itself does not answer Yahweh's question.[23] The question remains open whether this laughing derives from contextually related motifs deriving in their own turn from the psychological situation of the protagonists, motifs such as helplessness, joy, doubt, or a feeling of superiority, or whether one should merely focus on etymological resonance

22. So, e.g., Preuss, 147.

23. Concerning the literary device of vagueness, see H. Utzschneider, "Das hermeneutische Problem der Undeutigkeit biblischer Texte," *EvT* 48 (1988) 182-98, with additional bibliog.

with the name Isaac. Only the imagination of the reader or interpreter is being addressed. Hence one must avoid overextending the interpretation the way, for example, the Luther Bible does. Motivated by the need to explain Sarah's "inappropriate" behavior toward Yahweh, its translation understands *wattiṣḥaq* at the beginning of 18:12, which merely characterizes the simple progression of events, in the sense of "so/therefore Sarah laughed." Doing so, however, excludes the possibility of understanding Sarah's laughing as having been motivated by factors other than her knowledge of the "objective" impossibility of the promised pregnancy. But as 18:15 demonstrates and despite the previously posed question, Yahweh is not at all concerned with Sarah's motivation, but only with the fact of her laughing, which is apparently assigned a neutral value, since the Deity imposes no sanctions.

Nor are the two remaining passages without prepositional objects really able to relativize these findings, though at least the context of Prov. 29:9 does show with relative clarity that the fools' naiveté motivates their laughing or their laughable behavior. By contrast, Jgs. 16:27 leaves both the motivation and the content of Samson's *śᵉḥôq* completely open and merely relates that the Philistines watched as Samson performed. Indeed, here it is not even clear who is actually laughing — Samson, the spectators, or both — so that to the extent readers interpret the missing information extensively or from the perspective of the end of the story, they might even conclude that in a way the passage offers an explication of the proverb "those who laugh last, laugh best." (Concerning the problem of why v. 25, where the Philistines articulate their "request" to Samson, uses the piel twice and yet here, where the actualization is described, the qal, Jenni suggests that v. 25 expresses sequential individual actions, whereas v. 27 expresses the execution of the action as such, the actualization; it is also possible, however, that in v. 25 the author wanted to exploit the ambivalence of the intentionally unvocalized form, which could be qal or piel; i.e., the Philistines use Samson for their own entertainment [piel], but he who "laughs" last [qal] is Samson[24].)

Passages with prepositional phrases most frequently use expressions with the prep. *lᵉ* (10 times with *śḥq*, once with *ṣḥq*), with a certain concentration of such passages appearing in Job (5 times), which are all the more interesting because in 4 of these occurrences the subject of the laughing is an animal (39:7, a wild ass; 39:18, an ostrich; 39:22, a horse; 41:21, Leviathan).[25] The (prepositional) objects as well as the context make clear that these passages understand laughing as a sign of superiority. These wild animals, created by the almighty Creator, mock human attempts to demonstrate their own superiority over the animals. This position implicitly criticizes the claim to human dominion over the animal world formulated in Ps. 8:7(6) and Gen. 1:26, whose basis is a hierarchical view of creation. The author articulates the common status of all creatures by describing animals anthropomorphically as beings that can also laugh. This ability to laugh coupled with a focus on the individual gifts the Creator bestows upon

24. *HP,* 156; see in this regard also I.3 above.

25. Reines, 176, apparently overlooked these passages, since he says that animals do not laugh.

all creatures demonstrates to the wisdom author that the human claim to superiority is simply laughable.[26] Job 5:22a also focuses on laughing as an expression of superiority, albeit here of human beings themselves, whose connection with God comes to expression in being taken in hand by God. Although this passage seems to contradict the ones just discussed, the calming reassurance that Job might laugh at destruction and famine clearly relates syntactically more to the previously enumerated dangers caused by human beings than to the subsequent summons not to fear wild animals as well. It is highly improbable that the passage uses *'al* + jussive to express the "conviction that something could or would not be permitted to happen,"[27] since the preceding verses articulate precisely the same notion with *lō'* + indicative. Laughing at destruction and famine thus has nothing to do with the premise of natural human superiority over animals, expressing rather Eliphaz's pious conviction that Job can be confident that God will preserve him despite all dangers.

Whereas the book of Job addresses laughing as an expression of God-given superiority, Gen. 21:6 *(ṣḥq)* and Prov. 31:25 mention human laughing without any reference to God; moreover, Gen. 21:6 leaves open the question whether *lᵉ* here is used merely to designate Sarah as the target of this otherwise unspecified (joyous, helpless, or mocking) laughing, or is used in the sense of "laughing at." By contrast, Prov. 31:25 is much less ambivalent in focusing on the self-confidence of the laughing person; because of her own inner strength and dignity, the capable wife is not afraid of the coming day and hence laughs at whatever may be coming. This understanding applies even more to the wild nation mentioned in Hab. 1:10 and secondarily identified with the Chaldeans, even though Habakkuk follows a widespread prophetic tradition in adding the restriction that it is, after all, Yahweh who rouses this people (v. 6); the concentration here of the semantically related terms *śḥq, miśḥāq,* and *qls* hithpael ("make fun of something"[28]) can hardly be explained otherwise. This people is so powerful and superior that they break out laughing *(śḥq)* when they see the fortifications and can only scoff *(qls)* at kings. Allegedly powerful rulers merely make them laugh *(miśḥāq).*

Something analogous applies, of course, when Yahweh (Ps. 59:9[8]), "he who sits in the heavens" (2:4), or the Lord (37:13) laughs at something or someone. Here the focus is on the mockery of the superior party, as is clearly shown by the context or (2:4; 59:9[8]) by the par. *l'g.* Similiar to the way Hab. 1:10 articulates the superiority of the distant wild nation with words from the semantic field of *śḥq,* so the psalmist in Ps. 2:4 describes the superiority of the Lord "who sits in the heavens" over kings and rulers who dare to threaten the king of Israel appointed as ruler on Zion, a figurative anthropomorphic portrayal of the political and military superiority of the God of Israel.[29] Ps. 59:9(8) uses the same imagery to articulate Yahweh's power to aid the indi-

---

26. In this regard see R. Bartelmus, "Die Tierwelt in der Bibel. Exegetische Beobachtungen zu einem Teilaspekt der Diskussion um eine Theologie der Natur," *BN* 37 (1987) 26-32.

27. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 133, with reference to *GK,* §109e.

28. See I.4 above.

29. We may leave open the question whether this notion was also portrayed in a cultic drama, as suggested by, among others, A. Weiser, *Psalms. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), in loc.; cf. Preuss, 150.

vidual, as does, with slight variation, 37:13 to describe God's reaction to the problem of the perceived superiority of the wicked over the righteous. All three passages employ a change from the human to the divine perspective to make clear that the human being who feels threatened actually has just as much occasion to laugh as does God himself.

The problem of superiority also appears in passages where *śḥq* is used with *'al.* Among such passages, the argumentative structure in Ps. 52:8(6) corresponds exactly to that in 37:13, albeit without the change of perspective. Assured of God's help, the righteous themselves laugh at evildoers. Quite the reverse is the case in Job 30:1, where Job complains bitterly that even those who are younger than he and whose fathers he "disdained to set with the dogs of my flock" now laugh at him in the misery that has come upon him despite his righteousness. Lam. 1:7 similarly laments that enemies laugh at Jerusalem's downfall even though earlier Jerusalem was able to count on God's help.

Prov. 1:26 uses *śḥq* with a temporal qualification expressed by *b^e,* yet its *parallelismus membrorum* fixes it semantically as a statement with *l'g* in the sense of the passages just discussed. Here wisdom announces that it will laugh and mock at those who refuse her instruction. By contrast, the association of *śḥq* with *'el* in Job 29:24 is probably not meant negatively, though the traditional MT is unclear. The overall text seems to focus on Job recounting how he took up the cause of those of lesser means, including smiling (cordially) upon them in order to gain their confidence.

Textual problems also attach to the only occurrence of *śḥq* hiphil (2 Ch. 30:10), albeit only in the sense that several mss. attest the piel instead of the hiphil. The expressions using *'al* and the par. *l'g* do make clear that the couriers Hezekiah sends to the northern kingdom within the framework of his cultic reforms are laughed at and mocked there.

The passages using the piel of *śḥq/ṣḥq* include ten that use the verb without a prepositional phrase: Gen. 19:14 (the following qualifier refers to *way^{e}hî* rather than to *m^{e}ṣaḥēq*); 21:9 and Ex. 32:6 (with *ṣḥq*) and 1 S. 18:7; 1 Ch. 15:29; Job 40:20; Prov. 26:19; Jer. 15:17; 30:19; 31:4 (with *śḥq*). Among these passages, 1 Ch. 15:29 occupies a special position in that the behavior under discussion is specified in the parallel passages (2 S. 6:5,21 and 1 Ch. 13:8), which deal with the same issue, by the expression *lipnê yhwh,* so that 1 Ch. 15:29 is best discussed in connection with passages using that expression.

Very few passages reveal the exact nature of the cheerful activities prompting such laughing.[30] The reference is relatively clear in Gen. 19:14 and Prov. 26:19, which apparently focus on "joking" in the figurative sense. The remaining passages generally involve cheerful, playful activities where it does, however, remain open (and probably must remain open commensurate with the authors' own intentions[31]) whether and to

30. See I.3 above.

31. Regarding the literary principle of indefiniteness, see above; similarly already H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Eng. trans. Macon, Ga., 1997), 226, on Gen. 21:8-9.

what extent these games involve the sexual dimension, as also clearly attested in passages construed with prepositions (see the discussion below on Gen. 26:8; 39:14,17).[32] Although such connotations cannot be entirely excluded in any of these passages, some reservations do attach to Job 40:20 given the uncertain text. If the wisdom author of the divine discourses is arguing that human beings and animals are virtually equal, i.e., if he is saying that the animals of the field play on the mountains where Behemoth dwells or that the animals of the field who play there take wood to Behemoth,[33] then this connotation doubtless resonates as well, especially since from a zoological perspective the sexual element usually plays an important role in animal games. If, however, one follows *BHK*[3] and changes the form to a singular qal, this connotation disappears.

In Ex. 32:6; 1 S. 18:7; Jer. 30:19; 31:4, the word exhibits not only the previous connotations but that of dancing as well. Jer. 15:17 shows that participation in cheerful, playful activities was viewed as a basic part of a "humane" existence in ancient Israel; here Jeremiah characterizes his own disconsolate position by lamenting his exclusion from the circle of the *mᵉśaḥᵃqîm* (expressed indirectly in Jer. 30:19; 31:4).

The three passages in which a sexual connotation clearly emerges use prepositional expressions with *bᵉ* (Gen. 39:14,17) or *'eṯ* (26:8). The difference is easy to explain contextually. Isaac is "fooling around" with his wife, obviously with her full consent, whereas Potiphar's wife must insinuate that Joseph — whom she herself desired — wanted to use her as the object of his desires; by using *'eṯ,* she would have cast suspicions on herself.

The only passage using *śḥq* piel with *lᵉ* (Jgs. 16:25) was discussed in a preliminary fashion above (I.3). The obligatory suspicion attaching to passages with the qal, namely, that such use might be expressing the superiority of those who laugh, yields no sense here unless one adduces the wordplay discussed in connection with Jgs. 16:27. The MT by itself yields the following scene. The Philistines fetch the blind Samson so that he — helpless in his blindness — might perform cheerful games *for them* and thus make *them* laugh; both nuances inhere in the piel.

In recounting the actual entertainment, the author then changes prepositions *(lᵉ-lipnê)* and verbs *(śḥq-ṣḥq)* and merely relates that Samson performed his initially helpless and awkward games *for/before* the Philistines. It is obvious that this replacement of the preposition of usefulness or of goal by the neutral "for" or "before" provides the first hidden indication from the author that the Philistines actually have no reason to laugh at Samson's antics, and that, indeed, their laughing will soon cease (cf. what was said above about Jgs. 16:27).

Little else can be said about the remaining passages using *śḥq/ṣḥq* with *lipnê,* since these, too, involve a simple (spatial) qualifier merely restricting the activity associated

---

32. Regarding this question, cf., e.g., J. M. Sasson, "The Worship of the Golden Calf," *Orient and Occident. FS C. H. Gordon. AOAT* 22 (1973), 152, who disagrees that the word carries any sexual connotations in Ex. 32:6; and K. Jaroš, *Die Stellung des Elohisten zur kanaanäischen Religion. OBO* 4 (1974), 385-86, who does think the word carries such connotations (on p. 386 n. 1, read "2 S. 6:5,21" instead of "2 S. 26:5,21"); additional bibliog. from both authors.

33. So Fohrer, 522.

with the absolutely used verb to a specific sphere. Nonetheless, 2 S. 2:14-15 also suggests that such passages need not always involve merely a harmless game, and that the term can be understood so broadly that it also includes war games.[34] According to F. Stolz, however, the reference is not to a game at all, but to something mortally dangerous, namely, a ritual initiating the general battle.[35] Stolz is unable to explain how the passage can nonetheless speak of *śḥq,* so that one might perhaps better understand the passage as referring to a sudden change from a game to something more serious, or to a battle trick that both sides try to implement simultaneously but that then goes wrong, since ultimately twenty-four young men lie dead on the battlefield in Helkath-hazzurim, the locale that was previously a place for "games." All remaining passages fit effortlessly in the schema discussed above, whereby one does notice that a *śḥq/ṣḥq* (piel) is not only possible before Yahweh but is in fact mentioned relatively often. The Yahweh cult of the preexilic period apparently included more playful or even orgiastic elements than Jews or Christians were either willing or able to incorporate into their own acceptance of the ancient Israelite religion.

Prov. 8:30 can also be mentioned along with the three previously discussed passages in the Deuteronomistic History and the Chronicler's History (2 S. 6:5,21; 1 Ch. 13:8) that apparently refer to David's or Israel's orgiastic dancing before the ark of Yahweh. David's wife Michal would hardly have raised the accusation of nakedness and dissolute behavior merely because an article of clothing had shifted a few centimeters (2 S. 6:20; 1 Ch. 15:29, following the extremely positive view of David in Chronicles, reduces this charge to Michal merely "despising" David as he dances). In Prov. 8:30 it is best to follow Keel in assuming that the wisdom author is referring not to a mere hypostasis, but rather to an actual female being who was present as a "jesting" companion to God at the creation, a being who really does "delight" God and in doing so gives wings to his creative actions.[36] Just how important this configuration apparently is or was to the author emerges from its repetition in v. 31, this time construed with the prep. *bᵉ* to indicate the location where wisdom engages in her playful activities that stimulate the creator God.[37]

Ps. 104:26 presents a similar problem, since the question of whether Yahweh created Leviathan to play *in* or *with* the water can be answered unequivocally neither through a comparison with other passages nor through any contextual analysis, even though most authors argue as if there was no problem here in the first place.[38] Zech. 8:5 shows that *bᵉ* can be used with *śḥq* piel as a pure indicator of location, since the boys and girls are hardly playing *with* the streets, but rather *in* them. That the same expression can also be intended instrumentally emerges not only from Gen. 39:14,17 (with

---

34. So *KBL²,* 801, 918; *HP,* 155.

35. F. Stolz, *Das erste und zweite Buch Samuel. ZBK* 9 (1981), 193-94.

36. Keel, 68-74.

37. A different view is taken by P. A. H. de Boer, "The Counsellor," *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. FS H. H. Rowley. SVT* 3 (1955), 69-70, who understands *bᵉ* instrumentally and accordingly assumes that Wisdom views the entire earth as her toy.

38. As does even Keel, 72.

ṣḥq), but also from Job 40:29(41:5), where God makes clear which boundaries apply to human beings (Job) by pointing out in the form of a rhetorical question that the latter, quite in contrast to the Creator, certainly cannot play *with* Leviathan or leash it for his girls (as a toy). Even though Job 40:29(41:5) and Ps. 104:26 are theologically quite similar, the same cannot be said about their content, not least because Leviathan plays a different role in the different texts. In Job 40:25-31(41:1-8) reference to Leviathan functions as a concluding and irrefutable argument for God's limitless power at the end and climax of the debate between Job and God; in the hymn of Ps. 104 Leviathan is merely one of many animals God has created and to whom he has given a place on earth, animals for which God cares and who together represent the goodness of creation for which the psalmist is offering thanksgiving to God. Hence it seems advisable to take seriously the ambivalence of this expression in the sense of the previously mentioned principle of indefiniteness and to view both possibilities as a solution — not as a lazy compromise, but because this position probably does better justice to the poetic freedom and greatness of the psalmist. God has given Leviathan, too, a place in the sea where the creature can entertain itself just as do the other fish; but he also created Leviathan in order to "jest" with him. The question must remain open whether this jesting is to be understood as harmlessly as Keel suggests, or whether the reference articulates God's superiority over Leviathan.[39] In any event one cannot show unequivocally that this reference is articulating God's "absolute dominion over Leviathan."[40]

2. *śᵉḥôq/ṣᵉḥōq*. The 17 occurrences of the substs. *śᵉḥôq/ṣᵉḥōq* offer little that is new or theologically more enlightening than what has already emerged with regard to the qal of the roots. When Sarah says that God has brought *ṣᵉḥōq* for her (Gen. 21:6), one can indeed understand this statement to mean that God has prompted a loose, relaxed disposition in her; but it can also mean that God made her the target of derision. The ambivalence already ascertained with regard to the verbal continuation of this statement also applies to the noun. By contrast, the laughing in Ezk. 23:32 is unequivocally to be understood in the sense of mockery, since the passage also speaks in a parallel fashion about *laʿag* in that Oholibah will allegedly be just as much the target of scorn as her sister, Oholah.

The same schema applies to the occurrences of *śᵉḥôq*. Alongside passages in which the context clearly shows the intended meaning to be mockery or scorn, one encounters other, ambivalent passages juxtaposing laughing in a quasi-absolute fashion with weeping or sorrow; still other passages use the lexeme in contexts fixing the meaning in the sense of a relaxed, cheerful laughing. The former passages include Job 12:4(bis); Jer. 20:7; 48:26,27,39; Lam. 3:14. Whether Jeremiah himself or Moab, Israel, Job, the righteous person, or the petitioner — all suffer as the target for laughing and scorn.

The passages using "laughter" as it were objectively, either in antithesis to sorrow or

39. Ibid. and n. 177; but cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), in loc., who views Leviathan as Yahweh's "pet."

40. Preuss, 109.

simply in describing the physiological and psychological process itself, are limited to the wisdom writings in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, which is not surprising given the examination of the verbal occurrences. Although references to the laughing of fools (Eccl. 7:6) do not really use the term positively, the negative assessment refers not to laughter as such, but rather to the inclination of fools to laugh at things or in situations not warranting laughing in the first place. With a slightly resigned undertone, Prov. 14:13 shows how closely related laughing and sorrow are, whereas Eccl. 7:3 insists that ultimately "sorrow is better than laughing" because difficult experiences improve the heart. (Additional statements develop this concept further, though the question remains whether Qoheleth is citing conventional wisdom here or his own convictions.) Qoheleth's conscious use of ambivalent terms in his argumentation also makes it unclear whether the assertion that laughter is mad and pleasure useless (Eccl. 2:2) is presented as an erroneous view of the author, who has slipped into the role of King Solomon, or whether it genuinely represents his firm conviction. The positive assessment of laughter in 10:9 and the allusions to joy in many other passages in the book, however, seem to militate in favor of the former solution.[41] Prov. 10:23 shows that at least those in wisdom circles viewed laughter positively. Even if fools enjoy doing wrong (in which case laughter is questionable), the wisdom writers offer the parallel situation in which wise conduct is a pleasure (prompting laughter) for a person of understanding; laughter in and for itself is clearly viewed positively here, even though its inappropriate use can distort it negatively.

This position applies even more to the two passages speaking about how "our mouth was filled with laughter, and our tongue with shouts of joy" (Job 8:21; Ps. 126:2), since the context makes clear that such laughter is a reaction to Yahweh's positive intervention. Here laughter is doubtless the expression of a relaxed and simultaneously joyous disposition.

III. Use Outside the Hebrew OT.

1. *LXX.* In translating *śḥq/ṣḥq* qal and its derived substantives, the LXX prefers lexemes from the semantically almost identical root **gel-*, e.g., *gelán, en[g]-/ek-/epi-/kata-gelán, geloiázein* or *geloiasmós, gélōs*. Other choices included *empaízein, euphraínein,* or *paignía.* Since as a rule the LXX also uses forms from the root **paiz-* (a root virtually identical in meaning with *śḥq/ṣḥq* piel) and *euphraínein (eneuphraínesthai)* ("make glad") as translation variants for *śḥq/ṣḥq* piel, one can see that the methodological doubts raised in I.2 above regarding the vocalization of the Masora are not wholly unfounded. (The term *paignía* in Jgs. 16:27, however, does not belong in this context, since this passage involves a "sense" translation of the form clearly identified as qal by the *mater lectionis w,* a translation that misunderstands the deeper meaning of the expression.) The LXX most frequently uses the simple, substantively corresponding *paízein* to render *śḥq/ṣḥq* piel, also using it once to clarify the intended *orcheísthai* parallel with *paízein,* which makes good sense in the context of 2 S. 6:21, since the issue involves David's

---

41. See in this regard R. Bartelmus, "Haben oder Sein: Anmerkungen zur Anthropologie des Buches Kohelet," *BN* 53 (1990) 50, 52, 56, etc.

dancing before the ark. (Here the LXX substantially altered the text, probably because of the dogmatic and ethical problems mentioned in II.1 above that later Judaism and Christianity had with David's behavior.) In Job 40:20 the LXX obviously had a different text, raising doubts whether *poieín charmonḗn* can be viewed as a translation of *śḥq* piel.

2. *Sirach and Qumran.* Of the 4 occurrences of *śḥq* in Sirach, 13:6,11; 47:3 hardly add anything new to the previous discussion. An understanding of *śḥq* qal + *lᵉ* in the sense of "smile at" (13:6,11) is commensurate with the previous discussions to the extent one remembers that the use of *lᵉ* instead of *'el* reflects common use during the later period of Hebrew. As expected, the LXX uses a compound of *gelán (prosgelán).* A more surprising situation is that *śḥq* piel + *lᵉ* can be used like expressions using *bᵉ* (47:3) (understanding *lᵉ* spatially with the LXX or instrumentally) such that the element of superiority on the part of the person "jesting" clearly comes to the forefront. Considering the passage being cited in Sir. 47:3 (1 S. 17:34-37), one does have the impression that the author is not referring to a harmless game of the sort found in Isa. 11:8, but rather to a game between David and the lion whose stakes are life and death (commensurate with 2 S. 2:14); once more the LXX uses *paízein* as the equivalent of *śḥq* piel. Finally, 32:12 (LXX) has no equivalent in the Hebrew text; here Sirach admonishes the reader not to be the last person to leave a cheerful gathering, but rather to leave earlier and then to "amuse yourself" *(paízein)* at home. Just which nuances attach to the word used absolutely here remains open. By comparison, the reasons for the use of *śḥq* in the Qumran version of Sir. 51:18 remain quite obscure (11QPsᵃ 21:15; G. Sauer translates "I resolved to play with her [Wisdom]," apparently understanding the final *h* as a suffix, contradicting customary usage, since it would then represent the only occurrence of the verb with a direct object[42]).

Commensurate with the eschatological, ascetic character of the Qumran community, laughter plays almost no role at all there. Apart from the citations from Hab. 1:10 in 1QpHab 4:1,4 and in their contextually conformist interpretation in 1QpHab 4:6, the Hebrew texts contain only one occurrence, and even this passage views laughter only as a sin: anyone who guffaws foolishly is excluded from the community for thirty days as punishment (1QS 7:14-15).

The Aramaic texts offer a similar picture. Because the book of Job exhibits a disproportionately high number of occurrences of *śḥq*,[43] its translation in 11QtgJob also attests a corresponding frequency for the Aramaic equivalent *ḥʿk*, e.g., in 7:5 (= 22:19); 15:1,4 (= 29:24; 30:1); 32:6 (= 39:7); 33:3 (= 39:22); and 35:7 (= 40:29[41:5]). Otherwise the term appears only in two additional passages, once in the otherwise obscure fragment 1Q67 1 *(mḥʿk)* and once in 4QAmram 2:14ᵃ *(ḥʿkyn;* 2:14ᵇ *hʿkn),*[44] which juxtaposes the archangel Michael with Belial as a laughing figure of light.

Bartelmus

---

42. G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach. JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 637, with reference to J. A. Sanders, "The Sirach 51 Acrostic," *FS A. Dupont-Sommer* (Paris, 1971), 431-32.

43. See I.2 above.

44. See Beyer, 212.

שָׂטָן *śāṭān;* שׂטן *śaṭan;* שָׂטַם *śāṭam.*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology and Meaning; 2. Occurrences. II. Human Adversaries. III. Superhuman Adversaries. IV. Qumran. V. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology and Meaning.* In Hebrew, *śāṭān* means "adversary, opponent." The root *śṭn* is attested in several Semitic languages, including Targumic Aramaic *(sṭn/śṭn),* Middle Hebrew *(sṭn; śṭn),* Syriac, Mandaic, Ethiopic, and Arabic.[1] T. Nöldeke emphasizes that in Ethiopic the root *śṭn* represents a Hebrew loanword that then passed into Arabic.[2] The root *śṭn* has not yet been attested in Akkadian. It allegedly occurs with the meaning "feud with, attack," as an epithet for Nergal and Ishtar, while others explain *mu-uš-ta-ti-nu* and *mu-uš-te-ti-na-at* as participles of a different root *(etêm/nu[m]).*[3]

Some scholars have tried to derive *śāṭān* from the root *šûṭ* (e.g., Torczyner, who postulates a relationship between the Arabic form *šaiṭān* and *šûṭ*). The connection between *śāṭān* and *šûṭ* ("roam about"), however, is to be viewed as a popular etymology; cf. Job 1:7 and 2:2, where Satan tells about his "going to and fro on the earth," where the author probably intends only to incorporate a bit of wordplay.[4]

The noun *śāṭān* probably derives from the vb. *śāṭan.*[5]

śāṭān. A. Brock-Utne, "'Der Feind.' Die alttestamentliche Satansgestalt im Lichte der sozialen Verhältnisse des nahen Orients," *Klio* 28 (1935) 219-27; K. F. de Blois, "How to Deal with Satan?" *BT* 37 (1986) 301-9; P. L. Day, *An Adversary in Heaven: śāṭān in the Hebrew Bible. HSM* 43 (1988); idem, "Abishai the *śāṭān* in 2 Samuel 19:17-24," *CBQ* 49 (1987) 543-47; H. Duhm, *Die bösen Geister im AT* (Tübingen, 1904), esp. 16-20, 58-61; W. Foerster, "σατανᾶς A: Qumran and Later Jewish Satanology," *TDNT,* VII, 151ff.; T. H. Gaster, "Satan," *IDB,* IV, 224-28; H. Haag, *Teufelsglaube* (Tübingen, ²1980), esp. 141-262; H. Kaupel, *Die Dämonen im AT* (Augsburg, 1930); R. Schärf Kluger, *Satan in the OT* (Evanston, 1967), esp. 25-53; A. Lods, "Les origines de la figure de Satan, des fonctions à la cour céleste," *Mélanges Syriens. FS R. Dussaud. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique* 30 (Paris, 1939), 649-60; B. Noack, *Satanás und Sotería* (Copenhagen, 1948); G. von Rad, "διαβάλλω, διάβολος B: The OT View of Satan," *TDNT,* II, 73-75; N. and H. W. Schnaper, "A Few Kind Words for the Devil," *Journal of Religion and Health* 8 (1969) 107-22; H. Torczyner, "Wie Satan in die Welt kam," *Mitteilungsblätter der hebräischen Universität Jerusalem* 4 (1938) 15-21; P. Volz, *Das Dämonische in Jahwe. SGV* 110 (1924).

1. For the Tgs.: J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim* (2 vols.; Leipzig, 1867), II, 155; for Middle Hebrew: *WTM,* III, 500-501; IV, 542; for Syriac: *CSD,* 373; for Mandaic: *MdD,* 311; see also 323-24; for Ethiopic: *LexLingAeth,* 394; for Arabic: *NBSS,* 34, 47; Wehr, 455.

2. Contra F. Praetorius, *ZDMG* 61 (1907) 619-20; on the Arabic see J. Horovitz, *Koranische Untersuchungen* (Berlin/Leipzig, 1926), 120-21; A. J. Wensinck and J. H. Kramers, *Handwörterbuch des Islam* (Leiden, 1941), 671-72.

3. For the former see K. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta* (Helsinki, 1938), 240. For the latter see *AHw,* I, 260; also G. Wanke, "שָׂטָן *śāṭān* adversary," *TLOT,* III, 1268; Day, *Adversary,* 23.

4. So also Day, *Adversary,* 21-22; Kluger, 31; Lods, 658-59.

5. So Kluger, 25ff., who distances himself from *BLe,* §61*; von Rad, 73; Day, *Adversary,* 17ff.

One secondary form, *śṭm,* is also attested in Jewish Aramaic.[6]

The root *śṭn* is the source not only of the vb. *śāṭan* and the noun *śāṭān,* but also the noun *śiṭnâ.* The secondary form *śṭm* yields the noun *maśṭēmâ.*

2. *Occurrences.* The noun *śāṭān* occurs 27 times in the OT: Nu. 22:22,32; 1 S. 29:4; 2 S. 19:23(Eng. 22); 1 K. 5:18(4); 11:14,23,25; 1 Ch. 21:1; Job 1:6,7(bis),8,9,12(bis); 2:1,2(bis),3,4,6,7; Ps. 109:6; Zech. 3:1,2(bis). The vb. *śāṭan* occurs 6 times: Ps. 38:21(20); 71:13; 109:4,20,29; Zech. 3:1. The form *śiṭnâ* I occurs in Ezra 4:6, *śiṭnâ* II in Gen. 26:21 *(nomen loci).* Finally, *śāṭam* occurs 6 times: Gen. 27:41; 49:23; 50:15; Job 16:9; 30:21; Ps. 55:4(3); and *maśṭēmâ* twice: Hos. 9:7,8.

II. Human Adversaries. The root *śṭn/śṭm* describes various forms of disputes and hostility between people. Brothers quarrel in a family. In Gen. 27:41 the vb. *śṭm* characterizes the hatred of Esau, who was aggrieved at Jacob *(wayyiśṭōm)* because of the blessing. In another quarrel among brothers, Joseph's brothers are afraid lest "Joseph still bears a grudge against us *(yiśṭᵉmēnû)* and pays us back in full for all the wrong" (50:15). According to 26:20-21, the herders of Gerar argue with those of Israel over two wells, which is why one of the wells is called *śiṭnâ* (v. 21).

Quarrels also arise in the political realm. In the war with the Philistines, the commanders balk at letting David take part in the war lest he become their adversary *(śāṭān)* (1 S. 29:4). In the quarrel between David and the sons of Zeruiah, David has become king of Israel and accuses Abishai and his brothers of becoming *lᵉśāṭān* (2 S. 19:23[22]). Although David was unable to build a temple "because of the warfare with which his enemies surrounded him," during the time of Solomon there was "neither adversary *(śāṭān)* nor misfortune" (1 K. 5:18[4]). Later, after Solomon had been seduced into idolatry by his foreign wives, he experienced the wrath of the God of Israel when the latter "raised up an adversary *(śāṭān)* against Solomon, Hadad the Edomite" (1 K. 11:14). God later "raised up another adversary *(śāṭān)* against Solomon, Rezon son of Eliada" (v. 23), and "he was an adversary *(śāṭān)* of Israel all the days of Solomon" (v. 25).

Jacob's blessing over his sons describes a war in which archers become angry and fight against Joseph (*wayyiśṭᵉmuhû,* Gen. 49:23), though Joseph emerges victorious "by the hands of the Mighty One." Several psalms describe the hatred of the adversary with the vb. *śṭn/śṭm.* Ps. 38:21(20) asserts that "those who render me evil for good are my adversaries" *(yiśṭᵉnûnî).* In Ps. 71:13 the persecuted petitioner pleads for God's help against enemies, asking, "let those who are hostile to my soul *(śōṭᵉnê napšî)* be put to shame and consumed." In 55:4(3) the psalmist complains that "those who cherish enmity against me" *(yiśṭᵉmûnî)* seek to bring trouble upon him. So also in Hos. 9:7-8, where the noun *maśṭēmâ* describes Israel's enmity against God and his prophets. These psalms and the prophet Hosea describe opposition as hostility, i.e., with the same terminology as the previously mentioned texts use in describing political and military events.

---

6. *WTM,* IV, 542.

In Ps. 109:4 the petitioner reproaches his enemies: "In return for my love[7] they accuse me" *(yiśṭᵉnûnî)*. Verse 20 specifies these enemies "who are against me" *(śōṭᵉnay)* with yet another charge, asserting that they speak evil against the petitioner; hence *śōṭᵉnay* could be translated as "my accusers." In this sense H. Schmid suggests that v. 29 identifies Ps. 109 as the prayer of the accused.[8] If this interpretation is correct, then the language of the psalm derives from jurisprudence. The adversaries are accusers who are taking the accused to court and even intend to have a wicked person stand at his right as an accuser *(śāṭān)* (v. 6; cf. also Zech. 3:1). The root *śṭn* can thus also be translated "accuse" in vv. 4,20,29. The life setting of this psalm is thus according to Schmidt the prayer of the accused during investigative proceedings in the sanctuary.[9]

This language probably derives from secular jurisprudence. We have no OT texts from such secular legal proceedings that use the root *śṭn/śṭm*. The closest approximation may be Ezra 4:6, where the Samaritans compose a *śiṭnâ* against the Jews who have returned from Babylon, accusing them of having begun rebuilding Jerusalem's walls because they are planning a rebellion against King Artaxerxes. By contrast, F. Horst understands this *śiṭnâ* to be not an "accusation," but a written *oppositio* presented by the Samaritan upper classes against Judah and Jerusalem.[10]

In the OT the root *śṭn/śṭm* refers to human adversaries and opposition in three different spheres: (1) in descriptions of personal family quarrels (brothers) or quarrels between two groups (herders); (2) in the terminology of war, either in connection with political events or in a petitioner's description of adversaries in the Psalms; (3) in legal terminology as attested in Ps. 109 and Ezra 4.

III. Superhuman Adversaries. The root *śṭn/śṭm* occurs most frequently in the book of Job (16 times), including 14 times in the prologue and twice in the dialogues. Only the noun (with the article: *haśśāṭān*) occurs in the prologue, and only the vb. *śāṭam* in the dialogues. In Job 1:6 *haśśāṭān* is part of the *bᵉnê hāʾᵉlōhîm*. Some interpreters understand *haśśāṭān* as a designation of function;[11] Horst suggests that this definite article shows that *haśśāṭān* refers to a function rather than to a characteristic. Although the determination of this function of Satan remains disputed, Horst identifies *haśśāṭān* as an opposer in God's court.[12]

Earlier interpreters (e.g., Duhm, Kaupel) classified *haśśāṭān* in a general fashion among the demons. Brock-Utne then adduced the political circumstances at the courts of the high kings in the Near East as the background for the figure of Satan. The lesser Palestinian rulers were dependent on the high king and feared anyone who might slander them at the court.[13] This suggestion gave rise to the opinion that Yahweh's court

---

7. → אהב *ʾāhaḇ (ʾāhabh)*, I, 99-118.
8. H. Schmidt, *Das Gebet der Angeklagten im AT. BZAW* 49 (1928), 40-46.
9. See also H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), in loc.
10. F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (⁴1983), 14.
11. So Kluger, 26-27, contra von Rad, 73.
12. Horst, 13-14.
13. See EA 254, 286.

also had its slanderer (cf. Job 1–2; Zech. 3). Torczyner believes that *haśśāṭān* is a functionary in the celestial court. Just as the ancient Near Eastern kings had their own subjects watched, so also Yahweh has Satan — as "God's eyes" — roam about in the world checking on people's loyalty. Lods also views the figure of Satan as a celestial official. In this sense *haśśāṭān* works as an agent of the divine police, though also occasionally as an accuser (Zech. 3; von Rad also understands *haśśāṭān* clearly as an accuser before a court, and more specifically as the heavenly public prosecutor and by no means as a demonic being[14]).

Kluger draws from the analytical psychology of C. G. Jung in emphasizing the demonic element again. On this view the figure of Satan is the result of a development in God's personality embodying the dark or severe side of Yahweh. Volz also views Job and his lament as fully valid proof that the severe side of the divine being was still present even late in Israel's history.

Several interpreters assume that in the prologue of Job 1–2, the author portrays God as a king with his officials; hence they understand *haśśāṭān* as a designation of function. It would also be possible to understand the prologue as a family drama with God in the role of the father. The theme of the prologue would then be Satan's jealousy against Job and his attempts to convince the father that his "favorite son" was not so well behaved and obedient without reason. On this view *haśśāṭān* would refer not to an office but to the activity in which this divine son engages, namely, hatred and quarrel. Yahweh's reaction resembles that of a father who wants to know whether his son fears him from selfless motives. Obedience suffices for a king, but not for a father. Because Yahweh is described as the head of a family, it is not surprising that he does not immediately dismiss Satan as would a king when his official gives him poor advice.

The family imagery also makes clear that *haśśāṭān* is not an independent being, but rather a figure subject to God's will just as a son is subject to his father's will. Only because God himself permits it is *haśśāṭān* able to test Job. The meaning then resembles that of the vb. *śāṭam* in Gen. 27:41; 50:15.

The vb. *śāṭam* occurs in Job 16:9 and 30:21. In 16:9 Job laments that "he has torn me in his wrath, and hated me *(wayyiśṭᵉmēnî)*." This passage uses the imagery of war in that God has come to resemble an enemy: "He has gnashed his teeth at me; my adversary *(ṣārî)* sharpens his eyes against me" (v. 9b). In 30:21 Job laments further that Yahweh has "turned cruel to me" *(lᵉʾakzār)*, "With the might of your hand you persecute me *(tiśṭᵉmēnî)*." The imagery of God's persecution resembles the imagery of war in Jacob's blessing (Gen. 49:23-24), where Joseph is pursued by archers *(wayyiśṭᵉmuhû)* but strengthened by God's hand (see discussion above).

One of the *bᵉnê hāʾᵉlōhîm* is called *haśśāṭān*. Although God himself persecutes and is hostile to Job, God's *malʾāḵ* can also be hostile. Because the prophet Balaam went with the Moabites, Yahweh became angry, "and the angel of Yahweh took his stand in the road as his adversary" (*lᵉśāṭān lô*, Nu. 22:22; cf. v. 32). Here the noun *śāṭān* clearly refers to an "opponent," someone who "stands in the way" and obstructs Balaam's plans.

---

14. Von Rad, 73-75.

Twice God raised up a *śāṭān* against Solomon who acted as an adversary to the king. The result in Nu. 22 is the same. Because God wants to thwart the Moabites' plan, he stands in their way in the figure of his angel.

In his fourth vision (Zech. 3), the prophet Zechariah sees the high priest Joshua standing before the angel of the Lord and *haśśāṭān* at Joshua's right, ready to accuse him *(l^eśiṭnô)*. According to Wanke, *haśśāṭān* appears as an "adversary . . . of the angel of Yahweh, apparently in order to diminish the angel's advantage with Joshua"; neither in the secular nor in the religious realm can one identify "any specifically juristic usage of the word" (Horst similarly finds that Satan nowhere appears as an accuser, but certainly does as an opposer).[15] It was only during the postbiblical period that the understanding of Satan as an accuser arose (cf. Rev. 12:10). By contrast, D. L. Petersen understands the precise description of Satan's position on the right side (as in Ps. 109:6) as evidence that *haśśāṭān* occupies the official role of accuser here.[16] In 3:2 the angel of Yahweh threatens Satan with the words, "Yahweh rebuke you,"[17] referring to Satan as "you who test Jerusalem" (*habbōḥēr bîrûšālāyim,* though this translation is disputed[18]). That *haśśāṭān* may indeed play the role of the accuser does not, of course, also mean that as such he is to be viewed as the heavenly public prosecutor; it is more likely that he was occasionally active as an accuser as well as a tempter.

Like the majority of other interpreters, Kluger too understands *śāṭān* in 1 Ch. 21:1 as a personal name, without the article.[19] According to 2 S. 24:1, it was Yahweh's anger that induced David to carry out a census. By contrast, 1 Ch. 21:1 asserts that "*śāṭān* stood up against Israel, and incited David to count the people of Israel." The Chronicler's theology does not allow him to have God induce a person to do something for which God then later punishes that person. Hence he shifts the initiative from God's own anger to *śāṭān.* The Chronicler quite logically makes God's adversary responsible for evil. This adversary is, of course, to be understood as an independent figure and thus appears only as *śāṭān* rather than as *haśśāṭān.* It is also possible, however, that 1 Ch. 21:1 is not speaking about a specific celestial adversary of God, but about an indefinite earthly *śāṭān* who seeks to thwart David's plans. One need only recall the various adversaries of Solomon in 1 K. 11:14,23,25. According to Day, *śāṭān* does not represent a personal name; the term refers rather to a heavenly accuser.[20]

IV. Qumran. The root *śṭn* occurs only 5 times in the Qumran writings, unfortunately generally in fragmentary texts (1QH fr. 4:6; 45:3; 1QSb 1:8), making it difficult to determine whether *śṭn* is being used as a personal name or as an appellative.[21] These

---

15. Wanke, 1269; Horst, 14.

16. D. L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1–8. OTL* (1984), 188-90; cf. also C. L. and E. M. Myers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8. AB* 25B (1987), 183-86.

17. → גער *gā'ar,* III, 49-53.

18. See R. North, "Angel-Prophet or Satan-Prophet," *ZAW* 82 (1970) 59.

19. Kluger, 39, 155.

20. *Adversary,* 144.

21. Foerster, 154.

writings usually refer to Satan by the name Belial[22] (e.g., 1QS 1:18,23; 2:5,19; 1QH 2:16; 4:13; 1QM 4:2; 14:9). The presence of parallels, however, does enable two occurrences of *śṭn* to reveal a bit more. 4QDibHam[a] 1-2, IV, 12 picks up the motif of the pilgrimage of nations to Jerusalem during which all peoples bring their precious gifts to honor the people and the city, Zion and the temple. The passage describes this salutary situation as follows: *w'yn śṭn wpg' r' ky'm šlm wbrkh,* "and there was neither adversary nor misfortune, but peace and blessing." By contrast, 11QPs[a] XIX (Plea for Deliverance), 15 seems to focus specifically on Satan when the petitioner asks: "Let not Satan [Belial] dominate me, nor an unclean spirit *(rwḥ ṭm'h);* let pain *(mk'b)* and the evil inclination *(yṣr r')* not possess my bones."

The form *maśṭēmâ* apparently occurs only as an abstraction (1QS 3:23; 1QM 13:4,11; CD 16:5; 4Q390 I, 11; II, 7; 4Q286 10, II, 2; 387 3, III, 4), even though the name occurs frequently in the book of Jubilees (Jub. 10:8; 17:16; 18:9; 48:2ff.; 49:2).[23]

V. LXX. The LXX translates the vb. *śāṭan/śāṭam* with various words that primarily indicate hostile behavior, e.g., "quarrel, attack, remember evil, cast down," or "castigate." The most frequent verb is *endiabállein.* The LXX generally translates the noun *śāṭān* with the noun *diábolos*[24] (cf. Zech. 3:1,2; Job 1:6ff., *ho diábolos;* 1 Ch. 21:1; Ps. 109:6, *diábolos,* without the article). The vb. *diabállein* means "separate, split up," and probably provides the semantic basis for the meaning of the noun. The vb. *endiabállein* occurs in Nu. 22:22, *eis diabolḗn* in Nu. 23:32. The noun *epíboulos* (1 S. 29:4; 2 S. 19:23[22]; 1 K. 5:18[4]) refers to hostile intentions toward someone or to an assault on someone. The term *satán* occcurs in 1 K. 11:14 and 23, *antikeímenos* in 11:25 ("adversary").

The Greek terms refer primarily to the adversary and enemy. In Zech. 3:1-2 as well, where *ho diábolos* appears as the accuser, the vb. *śāṭan* is translated as *antikeísthai.* Nowhere does the LXX translate *śāṭān* as "slanderer."[25]

Nielsen

22. → בליעל *bᵉliyya'al,* II, 131-36.
23. → דבה *dibbâ (dibbāh),* III, 72-79; on the name Beelzebul see Day, *Adversary,* 151ff.
24. See W. Foerster, "διαβάλλω, διάβολος," *TDNT,* II, 71-73.
25. See ibid., 73.

שֵׂיבָה śêḇâ; שִׂיב śîḇ; שֵׂיב śêḇ

Contents: I. Etymology and Meaning. II. The View of Aging in Ancient Near Eastern Cultures: 1. Egypt; 2. Mesopotamia; 3. Canaan. III. *śêḇâ* in the OT: 1. Distribution; 2. Word Field; 3. Meaning: a. Age and Esteem; b. Problems of Old Age; c. The Elderly and Law; d. Theological Considerations. IV. 1. Sirach; 2. LXX; 3. Qumran.

I. Etymology and Meaning. Like its rare secondary form *śêḇ* (1 K. 14:4), the noun *śêḇâ* is a substantival infinitive of a medial-*y* verb, which is itself possibly also attested in Biblical Hebrew (1 S. 12:2).[1] The root is common Semitic. Old Babylonian already attests the word *šību,* "gray" (said of materials, houses, hair, wool), "gray-haired, old" (said of people and animals), with scholars holding different positions regarding the semantic development from "gray" to "old" or vice versa.[2] The feminine form *šībtu* refers to "that which is gray, gray hair, old woman, aged woman." In a twofold manner, these terms then also refer to the "elders" as officials,[3] as advisers to kings, as dignitaries in cities, as parliamentary representatives, etc. (though in the OT this meaning is associated not with *śêḇâ* but with → זקן *zāqēn*), and as "witnesses" (for contracts, alliances, though also for omens). Finally, *šību* also refers to the constellation Perseus.

Ugaritic attests the vb. *šyb,* "become gray, old," and the nouns *šb,* "old man," and *šbt,* "gray hair," the latter often parallel with *dqn* (→ זקן *zāqēn*) in the meaning "old and gray."[4]

śêḇâ. D. Buzy, "Le portrait de la vieillesse (Ecclésiaste, XII, 1-7)," *RB* 41 (1932) 329-40; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 396-97; J. G. Harris, *Biblical Perspectives on Aging: God and the Elderly* (Philadelphia, 1987); F.-L. Hossfeld, "Graue Panther im AT? Das Alter in the Bibel," *Arzt und Christ* 36 (1990) 1-11; B. Lang, "Altersversorgung, Begräbnis und Elterngebot," *ZDMG* Sup III/1 (1977) 149-56; idem, "Altersversorgung in der biblischen Welt," *Wie wird man Prophet in Israel? Aufsätze zum AT* (Düsseldorf, 1980), 90-103; J.-P. Prévost, "Vieillir ou ne pas vieillir? Le point de vue de l'AT," *EgT* 16 (1985) 9-24; K. Rahner, *Zum theologischen und anthropologischen Grundverständnis des Alters. Schriften zur Theologie* 15 (Zurich, 1983), 315-25; L. Ruppert, "Der alte Mensch aus der Sicht des AT," *TTZ* 85 (1976) 270-81; J. Scharbert, "Das Alter und die Alten in der Bibel," *Saeculum* 30 (1979) 338-54; idem, "Alter," *NBL* I, 82-83; idem, "Die Altersbeschwerden in der ägyptischen, babylonischen und biblischen Weisheit," *Lingua restituta orientalis. FS J. Assfalg. ÄAT* 20 (1990), 289-98. → זקן *zāqēn,* IV, 122-31.

1. See *BLe,* §61q; *HAL,* III, 1318a.

2. *AHw,* III, 1228-29. Cf. H. Holma, *Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen. AnAcScFen* B VII/1 (1911), 34, 172; F. R. Kraus, *Die physiognomischen Omnia der Babylonier. MVÄG* 40/2 (1935), 88, 126-34; É. Dhorme, *L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en accadien* (Paris, 1923), 42.

3. Cf. H. Klengel, "Zu den šībūtum in altbabylonischer Zeit," *Or* 29 (1960) 357-75; idem, "Die Rolle des 'Ältesten' (LÚ^{MEŠ}ŠU.GI) im Kleinasien der Hethiterzeit," *ZA* 57 [N.S. 23] (1965) 223-36.

4. *WUS,* no. 2573; *UT,* no. 2407. Cf. Ps. 71:18 and M. J. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 346, no. 533; on the disputed occurrence in *KTU* 1.3, II, 16, see O. Loretz, "Ugaritische und hebräische Lexicographie," *UF* 12 (1980) 282, who derives *šbm* from the root *šwp,* "aim at, attack."

Syriac attests the lexeme *sᵉbā'* and the metathetic *se'b, sābā',* and *saybūtā',* "old man, ancestor," similarly also Mandaic and Christian Palestinian Aramaic.[5] One Palmyrene text contains the word *sybw,* "old age."[6]

The root is widespread in Aramaic, occurring in 4 passages in the Ahiqar story in which Ahiqar refers to himself as an "old man" *(śaḇ),*[7] and in 5 additional passages in Biblical Aramaic (Ezra 5–6), albeit here basically only in construct expressions or otherwise qualified by a genitive with the meaning "elders." 1 En. 10:17 uses *śêḇâ,* "old age," in opposition to *ʿalîmûṯ,* "youth."[8] The Jewish Aramaic lexeme also occurs in several personal names (cf. *Sab[b]a[s]* and *Barsab[b]as* [ברשבא]; cf. Acts 1:23; 15:22).

Finally, the lexeme is well attested in the South Semitic language group. Arabic attests *šāba (šyb),* "be/become old, white-haired," *šaib,* "grayness of hair, old age," and a series of compound personal names.[9] Ethiopic includes *šēba* and *šībat,* "gray-haired," with corresponding terms in Amharic and Tigre.[10]

II. The View of Aging in Ancient Near Eastern Cultures. Because the problem of the elderly in the ambience of ancient Israel has not yet been fully explored, what follows can only offer preliminary information.

1. *Egypt.* Just as the portrayal of the elderly in Egyptian painting and relief art is quite realistic (corpulent figures, bent-over posture, support cane, etc.), so also Egyptian texts portray old age with all its troubles, even though old age is everywhere emphasized as the locus of wisdom and of a valid claim to respect. The respect the younger generation had for the elderly becomes especially apparent in the designation of a person's son and successor as *mdw iȝwy,* "staff of old age."[11] Even here, however, the customary care for the aged must be augmented by the emphasis provided by inheritance laws.[12] Though the ideal age is put at 110 years, the continuation of a person's name is even more important. Even the gods are subject to aging.[13] Old age was viewed as a sign not only of divine favor but also of a life pleasing to the gods.[14]

2. *Mesopotamia.* The elderly, the "gray-haired ones," enjoy special respect in Mesopotamia. People hoped to reach an advanced age, which was viewed as a sign of divine blessing. Accordingly, one wished kings a long life and old age while cursing unpleas-

---

5. *LexSyr,* 469; *MdD,* 303, 324.
6. Ber. III 99, 6; cf. *DNSI,* II, 784.
7. Ahiqar 6,17,26,35; *ANET,* 427, "this old man Ahiqar."
8. Additional documentation in Beyer, 706.
9. Cf. Wehr, 496; Ryckmans, I, 208.
10. *LexLingAeth,* 264. Cf. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 539; idem, *Concise Amharic Dictionary* (Berkeley, 1976), 64; *WbTigr,* 227.
11. See *WbÄS,* II, 178.
12. See E. Seidl, *ZDMG* 107 (1957) 270-81.
13. See *LexÄg,* I, 154-56.
14. On the provisions for one's old age see *LexÄg,* I, 158-59.

ant persons and entreating the gods to prevent the latter from seeing old age. It was because of their wealth of knowledge and their overall experience that the elderly were given such respect; others wished to share in that treasure. At an early period, this view doubtless led to a kind of institutionalization of the office of elder, which in its own turn quickly permeated various social spheres as elders became members of the royal court, advisers to the king, or members of regional or city parliaments. Occasionally such elders even had the power to install or dismiss kings.[15] On the other hand, old age (designated by *šībūtu* until eighty years, thereafter by *littūtu*) could also be considered in a negative light in view of decreasing sexual potency.

3. *Canaan.* Few witnesses offering information about the respect and care accorded the aged and one's parents have emerged from Canaanite sources.[16]

III. *śêḇâ in the OT.*

1. *Distribution.* The verb occurs only twice in the OT (1 S. 12:2; Job 15:10 par. *yāšîš,* "aged, advanced in years"), the subst. inf. *śêḇ* only in 1 K. 14:4, which says that Ahijah of Shiloh's eyes were dim "because of his age" *(miśśêḇô).* The noun *śêḇâ,* "grayheadedness, old age," occurs 19 times, primarily in later texts. The term "grayhead" (*'îš śêḇâ,* Dt. 32:25) is a vivid circumscription for "old man." The diachrony of occurrences begins in the proverbial material of the early monarchy (Prov. 16:31; 20:29), continues on to the prophet Hosea (7:9) and the JE redactor (Gen. 42:38; 44:29,31, if one locates the passages from the Joseph story within the pentateuchal stratum), and finally to the exilic Dtr and P texts. The main collection of occurrences is found here and in post-Priestly texts and the Chronicler during the postexilic period. The Aramaic portion of the book of Ezra attests 5, Sirach 4 additional occurrences.

2. *Word Field.* The word field of *śêḇâ* is essentially identical with that of → זקן *zāqēn.* Synonyms include *yāšîš* (only in Job), *raḇ yāmîm* and *kabbîr yāmîm,* "advanced in days," *raḇ šānîm,* "advanced in years," and *kelaḥ* (all in Job). In contrast to *zāqēn, śêḇâ* has semantically preserved the external characteristic of old age, namely, grayheadedness. Another synonym is the collective designation *lahᵃqâ.*[17]

Antonyms include *na'ar, bāḥûr, yeleḏ, 'ûl,* and *ṣā'îr lᵉyāmîm,* "young in days."

The term is occasionally contrasted with terms associated with the womb, with childhood, and with youth in order to bring a comprehensive whole to expression, e.g., in the assertion that everyone — from young men to old men — will perish (Dt. 32:25), or in reference to how Yahweh will always carry (bear) his people, from the womb till they have become gray (Isa. 46:4).

---

15. → IV, 126.

16. See in this regard B. Lang, *ZDMG,* 151; O. Loretz, *Ugarit und die Bibel* (Darmstadt, 1990), 125-39.

17. See *HAL,* II, 521.

3. *Meaning.* a. *Age and Esteem.* Exclusively in late OT (Dtr and P) texts, one finds a glorification of advanced age reflected in the extraordinarily high ages reported for the patriarchs and other famous figures from Israel's history. Although these fictitious dates doubtless intend to pass along mythical or theological material, the additional attributes (e.g., "a good old age, an old man, full of years," Gen. 25:8, P) do show that what is in fact meant is an advanced age (within the framework of the longevity expectations of the time). On the one hand, one finds in the extremely advanced age of these ancestors a show of respect for these key figures of Israel's prehistory; on the other hand, the hagiographer is also using these numbers to bridge extreme spans of time.[18] Finally, the decrease in age figures indicates a steady decline from the ideal primeval period down to the sinful present.[19]

Because no one expected any form of life after death, all hoped that Yahweh would grant them a full life span in the here and now. Accordingly, the advanced ages of the patriarchs were understood as their just reward for having led a God-fearing life; and the "patriarchal death" after a long life and at the right moment, just when one's vital powers were declining and infirmity could be expected, was viewed as the ideal and was accordingly recorded for the great figures, including Abraham (Gen. 15:15, Dtr? 25:8, P), Isaac (Gen. 35:29, P), Gideon (Jgs. 8:32), and David (1 Ch. 29:28).[20]

Because Israelite religion focused on the here and now, it tended to view advanced age as a sign of divine favor and accordingly inculcated respect for the elderly in the younger generation on the basis of their former's wisdom and experience.[21] Not in every instance, however, are grayheadedness and old age cause for respect. Such is the case when David orders Solomon to execute Joab and Shimei despite their grayheadedness (1 K. 2:6,9).

b. *Problems of Old Age.* The figures given for old age swing over time between sixty and seventy years (an exception being Ps. 90:10), at which time — at the latest — a person is viewed as being an extremely old person whose existence is burdened with all sorts of age-related problems. The eyes of Ahijah of Shiloh were dim from age (1 K. 14:4; cf. Gen. 27:1; 48:10). One's limbs become plagued by gout and circulatory problems (1 K. 15:23), women cease bearing children (cf. Gen. 18:11), men's sexual potency decreases (1 K. 1:1-4), and one's physical energy declines (Ps. 71). Finally, one's ability to assert oneself dwindles in old age (cf. 1 S. 2:22-23; 2 S. 10ff.).

An old person prepares for death, for old age and death are closely related. A person asks for God's help in traversing the path to death (cf. Josh. 23:14; Ps. 71:18) and is anxious, since death means distance from God. In old age a person depends on the help of others who are, however, not always dependable. In such cases one's own sons are the best old-age insurance. The old man's heart clings to them (Gen. 42:38; 44:29,31).

---

18. Scharbert, 341.
19. Hossfeld, 3.
20. Additional documentation in Scharbert, 341-42.
21. See III.3.d below.

Daughters or daughters-in-law, however, can also assume this function. During Naomi's old age, Ruth is more important to her than seven sons (Ruth 4:15).[22]

The aging process is an automatic part of life about which neither an individual nor a people should deceive itself. Ephraim ages without noticing it and thus exposes himself to great danger (Hos. 7:9).

A positive attitude toward this phase of life, an attitude nonetheless without self-deception regarding the problems of old age, comes to expression when, as is the case in Ps. 71, the petitioners entrust their old age to Yahweh. Here a person can find peace and quiet (cf. 1 S. 2:6; Ps. 102:21,27[Eng. 20,26]) even though one must always acknowledge that this stage of life can and is viewed in a completely different light (cf. Eccl. 12:1-7).

c. *The Elderly and Law.* OT legal collections hardly speak explicitly at all about the elderly except to subsume the few regulations found in the genealogy of the parent commandment and to regulate one's behavior toward elderly parents (cf. Ex. 21:15,17). It is not until the postexilic Holiness Code that one finds the rule, "You shall rise before gray hair, and defer to the old *(zāqēn);* and you shall fear your God" (Lev. 19:32), though one might also view this regulation in connection with legal principles designed to preserve parental authority (cf. Lev. 20:9). The respect for one's elders addressed here provided the legal basis for the care of the elderly.

d. *Theological Considerations.* The few reliably old occurrences of *śêḇâ* from the early monarchy already represent positive assessments associating the word with a demand for respect, something that remains the case for the entire OT period even though the motivation behind this demand changes over time. Early wisdom typically esteems old age and has given us the image of gray hair as a crown of glory (Prov. 16:31). Here as in Prov. 20:29, the wisdom teacher is inculcating respect for the older generation among newer officials at the royal court. Youthful impetuosity is not always an attractive characteristic. One didactic example that was surely passed down quite early was the drastic episode involving a clash between the experienced, prudent, and mild wisdom of the elderly and the unreflected and destructive impetuosity of the youthful "hotheads" (1 K. 12).

The wisdom and experience of old age were viewed as proof of a personality pleasing to God (Prov. 4:9-10; Sir. 25:6). The postexilic (?) thanksgiving hymn Ps. 92 says that the righteous still produce fruit in old age and are always "green and full of sap" (v. 15[14]; cf. Ps. 1:3). God is a refuge even in old age for the righteous (Ps. 71:9,18). The author of the book of Job adduces the image of the glistening silver hair of the elderly in describing the wake of the hippopotamus (*beʰhēmôṯ,* Job 41:24[32]), a comparison widely attested in antiquity.[23]

The ethical assessment of old age makes a transition at this point into the realization

---

22. See in this regard I. Fischer, "Eine Schwiegertochter mehr wert als sieben Söhne! Rut 4,15," in Herlinde Pissarek-Hudelist and Luise Schottroff, eds., *Mit allen Sinnen glauben. Feministische Theologie unterwegs. FS E. Moltmann-Wendel. Gütersloher Taschenbücher/ Siebenstern* 532 (1991), 30-44.

23. See G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 530.

that advanced age and wisdom, or righteousness and a long life, do not always coincide even though such a view had already entered into the argumentation behind the parent commandment. Postexilic wisdom develops this position along its entire breadth, calling into question many of the traditional clichés in the process (cf. Job 12:12-13; 32:7ff.; Ps. 119:100; Prov. 16:31). Jesus Sirach later even expresses disgust at the adulterous old person (Sir. 25:2; cf. also Sus.[Dnl. 13:]52).

Hence the success of old age, with its immediate juxtaposition of weakness and greatness, foolishness and wisdom, obstinacy and prudent reserve, derives ultimately from Yahweh. "Hence for the Israelites, it was only through Yahweh's grace that old age could become a genuinely valuable stage of life and thus a positive possession in every respect."[24] It was precisely this understanding of a dignified advanced age as a visible sign of divine election that led during the postexilic period to the complex ethical demands of the Holiness Code (Lev. 19:32; see above), which juxtaposes respect for the elderly and fear of God in a reciprocal relationship, also providing the basis for the later development of the commandment concerning parents (cf. Sir. 3:1-16; 7:27-28; 8:6; Tob. 4:3-4; Prov. 23:22).[25]

Not until toward the end of the OT period, when belief in an afterlife began to assert itself, did the assessment of old age reach a theologically balanced form. The innerworldly restrictions attaching to the act-consequence nexus could finally be separated from one's view of old age. "For old age is not honored for length of time, or measured by number of years; but understanding is more than gray hair for anyone, and a blameless life counts more than ripe old age. . . . The righteous who have died will condemn the ungodly who are living, and youth that is quickly ended will condemn the prolonged old age of the unrighteous" (Wis. 4:8ff.,16).[26] Belief in the resurrection ultimately assuaged somewhat the many painful instances when the righteous died prematurely (cf. 2 Mc. 7).

IV. 1. *Sirach.* The terms *śybh/śyb* occur 4 times in Sirach.[27] These passages clearly attest high regard for old age. "Do not ignore the discourse of the aged (LXX *gerónṯōn*) . . . from them you learn how to understand and to give an answer when the need arises" (8:9). At assemblies and feasts one should allow the elderly (LXX *presbýtere*) to speak (32:3). Caleb is admired as someone to whom God gave strength, "which remained with him in his old age" (*héōs gḗrous,* 46:9). Nonetheless, one should not be ashamed to correct "the aged who are guilty of sexual immorality" (42:8).

2. *LXX.* The LXX generally translates this root with *gḗras* (10 times), then with derivations of *presb-* (8 times) and *polió́s/poliá/poleía* (7 times). It uses the vb. *katagēráskein* once.

---

24. Ruppert, 279.
25. See in this regard also Hossfeld, 10-11.
26. See Ruppert, 279.
27. D. Barthélemy and O. Rickenbacher, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Sirach* (Göttingen, 1973), 383.

3. *Qumran.* This root rarely occurs in the Qumran writings. In a community hymn the collective petitioner admits to being a person who has been caught in sin "from the womb until old age" (*mērehem wᵉʿad śêḇâ,* 1QH 4:30), but still knows that God will care for him even "until I am old" (9:34). In the Aramaic texts concerning the "new Jerusalem" (esp. 2Q24), the *śby'* constitute a group of priests.[28]

Fabry

---

28. See Beyer, 222.

שׂיח *śyḥ;* שִׂיחָה *śîḥâ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Use: 1. Meditation, Contemplation; 2. Expressions of Emotions: a. Lament; b. Praise; 3. Ps. 119; 4. 1 K. 18:27; 5. Other Passages; 6. Plants. III. 1. Jesus Sirach; 2. Qumran. IV. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Anticipating for a moment the results discussed under II below, I think it is best to address the question of etymology by Müller's analysis, according to which "if the Hebrew root שׂיח does indeed contain an acoustic element indicating heightened intensity, then its meaning resembles the root *ṣyḥ,* which is attested in many Semitic languages and which in Hebrew appears in the form צוח with consonantal ו."[1] This position leads us to extrabiblical parallels including Ugar. *ṣyḥ,* Mand. *ṣihua,* Eth. *ṣaw'a,* and to analogies in Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic.[2] "Given this extensive semantic agreement, one can probably not avoid assuming that some relationship obtains between the roots *śyḥ* and *ṣyḥ.*"[3]

2. *Occurrences.* The root *śyḥ* occurs 20 times as a verb, including twice in the pilpel (Ps. 143:5; Isa. 53:8), otherwise in the qal. The noun *śîaḥ* occurs 18 times, the form *śîḥâ* 3 times (Job 15:4; Ps. 119:97,99). A clear concentration of occurrences is found in the Psalms, which contain more than half of all occurrences (21), and in Job (10, including twice as the designation for a plant).

śyḥ. S. Mowinckel, "The Verb *śiᵃḥ* and the Nouns *śiᵃḥ, śiḥā,*" *ST* 15 (1961) 1-10; H.-P. Müller, "Die hebräische Wurzel שׂיח," *VT* 19 (1969) 361-71.

1. Müller, 370.
2. For Ugaritic: *UT,* no. 2162; for Mandaic: *MdD,* 393; cf. in this regard Müller, 371.
3. Müller, 371.

II. Use. No consensus has emerged in scholarship regarding the semantic content of *śyḥ*. Mowinckel suggests that the root is "always related to the inner, mental activity, to the emotional thinking and musing," with the focus not on any expression but rather on the inner process.[4] By contrast, Müller postulates (also in his dispute with Mowinckel) that the term "always involves the expression of emotion as an emphatically acoustic phenomenon."[5] An examination of the various contexts shows that few of the passages genuinely correspond to the meaning Mowinckel wishes to impose almost exclusively on the term, namely, that of an inner emotional process, so that Müller's findings seem to be basically correct.

1. *Meditation, Contemplation.* In Job 15:4 *śîḥâ* parallels *yir'â,* suggesting that the focus is not on audible forms but rather on an inner contemplation or disposition oriented toward God.[6] Müller even speaks here about a "habitual disposition," even though the context mentions language showing that fear (of God) and (correct) meditation (on God) have been "done away with," though K. Budde takes a different position in translating "you draw complaints before God," understanding *gr'* to mean "draw, drag."[7]

In Ps. 77:4,7,13(3,6,12); 143:5, the parallel vbs. → הגה *hāgâ,* → זכר *zāḵar,* → חפשׂ *ḥāpaś* similarly suggest that this passage focuses not primarily on audible forms of expression (neither does → המה *hāmâ* in Ps. 77:4[3] suggest a reference to language), but rather on meditation on Yahweh's deeds, which in these verses takes on an almost "dully brooding" character.[8] That is, although the psalmist is definitely meditating on God's good deeds, he does so in a context of despair such that this mood extends to the meditation itself.

A similarly negative mood provides the background to Job 7:13 and 9:27. Job 7:13 does not make clear whether here too the expression of the negatively oriented meditation is implied in the form of the lament. By contrast, 9:27 uses the contrasting *blg* in making perfectly clear that a perception of the emotion is implied even without a verbal form of expression.

2. *Expressions of Emotion.* a. *Lament.* The following passages also come from a negatively oriented context associating the root *śyḥ* with (usually) loud lament. Although 1 S. 1:16 does not mention an audible utterance, v. 13 does say that Hannah was moving her lips, so that in v. 16 one can assume that she had at least formulated her lament, albeit silently (*śîaḥ* par. *ka'as*). By contrast, the lament is clearly audible in Job 7:11; 10:1 (*'āśîḥâ* or *śiḥî* par. *'adabbᵉrâ*); 23:2 (*śîḥî* par. *'anāḥâ*), with the lament in these texts taking on the character of an accusation or rebellion (similarly also Job

4. Mowinckel, 8.
5. Müller, 365.
6. See G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 267.
7. Müller, 368; K. Budde, *Das Buch Hiob. HKAT* II/1 (²1913), 77.
8. So Müller, 367, on Ps. 77:7(6).

21:4?). Although G. Fohrer speaks about "sorrowful concern" in connection with Job 7:13, given the context this interpretation may be too reserved.[9]

With the accompanying word field of *midwānîm* *ʾᵃḇôy,* and *ʾôy,* the use of *śyḥ* in Prov. 23:29 is clearly intended in the sense of lament.

The root appears within the framework of songs of lament in Ps. 55:3,18(Eng. 2,17); 64:2(1); 102:1(S); 142:3(2), with the prevailing context always presuming an audible lament.

b. *Praise.* Contexts involving positive experiences include Jgs. 5:10; 1 Ch. 16:9; Ps. 104:34; 105:2; 145:5. Both 1 Ch. 16:9 and Ps. 105:2 use the imperative form *šîrû* parallel with *śîḥû* and *zammᵉrû,* whereby the semantic implications of *śyḥ* are clearly to be understood as a loud expression of joy at Yahweh's salvific deeds (cf. also Jgs. 5:10 with par. *bārᵃḵû* in v. 9). In Ps. 104:34 the noun *śîaḥ* possibly represents the entire hymn of praise, while Ps. 145:5 proclaims the intent to praise Yahweh in view of his salvific deeds.

3. *Ps. 119.* Of the 8 occurrences of the root *śyḥ* in Ps. 119, vv. 97 and 99 use the noun, while vv. 15,23,27,48,78,148 all use the verb. The preferred object is the *ḥuqqîm* (vv. 23,48) or the *piqqûḏîm* (vv. 15,78); other objects include the *tôrâ* (v. 97), the *ʿēḏôṯ* (v. 99), and the *ʾimrâ* (v. 148). All these objects include Yahweh as the reference point. The same applies to v. 27, where the obj. *niplāʾôṯ* initially seems to deviate from the framework of the other objects. The parallel *piqqûḏîm* in v. 27a, however, suggests that *niplāʾôṯ* is to be understood in analogy to the other objects as a circumscription for *piqqûḏîm.* These verses clearly are not associating any verbal forms of expression with the root (cf. the par. *nbṭ* in v. 15), referring instead to reflection and meditation.[10] Here, then, the meaning suggested by Mowinckel seems most noticeable. Moreover, the verse also suggests goal-oriented contemplation leading to a certain kind of behavior or action, since the context also implies that a person will keep the commandments and follow the precepts, though use of the noun *śîḥâ* (vv. 97,99) does cause the element of action to recede (cf. Job 15:4).

4. *1 K. 18:27.* 1 K. 18:27 presents special problems in understanding *śîaḥ.* In connection with Elijah's mockery of Baʿal, *śîaḥ* parallels *śîg* and *dereḵ lô* (variously with Baʿal as the attendant subj.). Two modes of interpretation stand juxtaposed here. The first ties *śîaḥ* to its traditional semantic context and understands someone being "in thought" to mean that Baʿal is in this sense not present or is en route. A completely different possibility emerges from the interpretation of G. R. Driver (as followed by J. Gray) or, similarly, from H. D. Preuss according to which *śîaḥ* refers to relieving oneself.[11] J. A.

---

9. On the notion of accusation and rebellion here, cf. N. C. Habel, *Job. OTL* (1985), 162, 197, 348; S. Terrien, *Job. CAT* 13 (1963), 172; also Fohrer, *Hiob,* 180.

10. See also Müller, 368. Müller senses a (theologizing) element of wisdom in the frequent appearance of *śyḥ.*

11. G. R. Driver, "Problems of Interpretation in the Heptateuch," *Mélanges Bibliques. FS A. Robert. Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris* 4 (1957), 67; J. Gray, *I and II Kings. OTL* (^{2}1970), 398; H. D. Preuss, *Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971), 86f., with reference to the Tgs. to this passage. See also *KBL*^{2}, 919.

Montgomery and H. S. Gehman confirm this interpretation with their reference to the similar interpretation in Rashi starting from a euphemistic understanding of *śîg.*[12]

5. *Other Passages.* In 2 K. 9:11 *śyḥ* can be understood in the sense of uncontrolled, nonsensical chattering. In Ps. 69:13(12) the parallel *n*ᵉ*gînâ* suggests that here too the reference is to verbal expressions, possibly to mockery or scorn.[13]

Prov. 6:22 seems to circumscribe the notion of instruction, since the "mother's teaching" is the subject of *t*ᵉ*śîḥeḵā* (v. 20). Here too, however, the reference may be to emotionally colored, "temperamental talk, specifically instruction delivered zealously or angrily."[14]

Isa. 53:8 is difficult to understand. Alongside *śyḥ,* the term *dwr* in v. 8aβ also raises problems for understanding. Since *dwr* can be interpreted as "fate, destiny," *śyḥ* might be construed in the sense of "lament." This understanding would also remain closer to the usual use of the root than does Westermann's variant, namely, "no one was concerned about him."[15] Müller's interpretation is also not without problems. He understands the passage as a reference to the "scolding instruction, reprimand" of contemporaries,[16] though the context hardly supports this view.

The text of Job 12:8 is problematic. Grammatically *śîaḥ* might be construed as an imperative, though doing so would raise considerable problems to understanding. Given the context, it is thus probably best to accept a conjecture and to read *ḥayyaṯ hā'āreṣ.*[17]

6. *Plants.* The noun *śîaḥ* exhibits no relationship to its traditional use in Gen. 2:5; 21:15; Job 30:4,7, where it refers to a plant (= shrub), possibly as a collective designation for bushes and shrubs.[18]

III. 1. *Jesus Sirach.* Except for Sir. 13:26, the root *śyḥ* always appears as a noun (13:11; 20:5; 32:4; 44:4 as *śîaḥ;* 6:35; 8:8; 11:8 as *śîḥâ*). The prevailing context shows that in all these passages the noun refers not to inner processes or their expression but to formulated speech.[19] Such speech is generally found in wisdom contexts such that in

---

12. J. A. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman, *The Books of Kings. ICC* (1951), 302; also 310-11, with reference to the various interpretive attempts for the noun series in v. 27. Similarly G. A. Rendsburg, "The Mock of Baal in 1 Kings 18:27," *CBQ* 50 (1988) 414-17.

13. Cf. Müller, 365, who in any case finds here a reference to a "noisy, emotionally laden expression."

14. Müller, 366.

15. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 265.

16. Müller, 366.

17. See Fohrer, *Hiob,* 237; a different position is taken by Müller, 369, who replaces *'ereṣ* with *zôḥ*ᵃ*lê;* similarly also B. Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob. KHC* XVI (1897), 67.

18. So B. Paradise, "Food for Thought: The Septuagint Translation of Genesis 1:11-12," *A Word in Season. FS W. McKane. JSOTSup* 42 (1986), 183; cf. also *KAI,* III, 24; on the occasionally suggested parallel use of *šḥt* and *śyḥ,* see J. M. Sasson, *RSP,* I, 433, no. 89m.

19. See Müller, 366-67.

Sir. 6:35 and 8:8 *śîḥâ* can even be understood as referring to the wisdom saying itself, also with a touch of irony in 32:4 (cf. also 44:4). A reference to general speech is found in 11:8; 13:11; 20:5. The background for the use of the verb in 13:26 is more likely brooding contemplation.

2. *Qumran.* The root *śyḥ* occurs 9 times in the Qumran writings: 1QS 10:16; 1QH 1:35; 6:11; 9:7,9; 11:5; 1QpMic 17–19:1; 4Q509 1:4; 11QPs[a] 18:12. In most passages *śyḥ* refers to audible praise of God (1QS 10:16; 1QH 6:11; 9:7; 11:5; 11QPs[a] 18:12). 1QH 1:35 may refer to the formulation of wisdom sayings given the combination *ḥkmym wśḥy d't.* 1QH 9:9 might be understood in the sense of reprimand. The contexts of 1QpMic 17–19:1 and 4Q509 1:4 preclude any unequivocal interpretation.

In summary, *śyḥ* refers essentially to the emotional perception of both depressing and uplifting experiences and to contemplation of such experiences, though this emotional perception or meditation is not limited to the spiritual life of human beings, nor does it refer exclusively to inner processes, aiming rather at expression through verbalization (or to corresponding behavior, as in Ps. 119).

IV. LXX. The LXX uses a variety of translation variants. The most frequent include *adoleschein* or *adoleschía* and *diēgeísthai,* though no clear issues of content seem to guide the choices.

Hausmann

שִׂים *śîm;* *תְּשׂוּמָה *t^eśûmâ*

Contents: I. 1. Attested Forms and Distribution; 2. Early Versions; 3. Etymology; 4. Homonyms; 5. Textual Criticism. II. 1. Expressions; 2. Word Field; 3. Meaning: a. Basic Considerations; b. Syntax; c. Idioms; d. Individual Cases; e. Ellipsis; f. Substantives; 4. Theological Themes. III. 1. Sirach; 2. Qumran.

śîm. G. C. Bottini, "'Pose la sua faccia tra le ginocchia.' 1 Re 18,42 e paralleli estrabiblici," *SBFLA* 32 (1982) 73-84; W. H. Brownlee, "'Son of Man Set Your Face': Ezekiel the Refugee Prophet," *HUCA* 54 (1983) 83-110; B. Couroyer, "'Mettre sa main sur sa bouche' en Égypte et dans la Bible," *RB* 67 (1960) 197-209; P. W. Coxon, "The Distribution of Synonyms in Biblical Aramaic in the Light of Official Aramaic and the Aramaic of Qumran," *RevQ* 9 (1977/78) 497-512; M. Dahood, "Hebrew Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 386-403, esp. 399-400; É. Dhorme, *L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en Hébreu et en Accadien* (1923; repr. Paris, 1963); H. J. van Dijk, "A Neglected Connotation of Three Hebrew Verbs," *VT* 18 (1968) 16-30; I. Eitan, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography* (New York, 1924); W. Gross, *Bileam. Literar- und formkritische Untersuchung der Prosa in Num 22–24. SANT* 38 (1974); E. Jenni, "Zur Semantik der hebräischen Personen-, Tier- und Dingvergleiche," *ZAH* 3 (1990) 133-66; A. Jirku, "'Das Haupt auf die Knie legen.' Eine ägyptisch-ugaritisch-israelistische Parallele," *ZDMG* 103 (1953) 372; P. Joüon, "Études de morphologie hébraïque,"

I. 1. *Attested Forms and Distribution.* The root *śîm* occurs in every OT book except Jonah and Ecclesiastes. In relation to textual length,[1] it occurs most frequently in Job (40 times), then, with decreasing proportionate frequency, in Isaiah (1–39 below average: 15 times; 40–55 far above average: 28 times; 56–66, 11 times), Minor Prophets (45), Exodus (50), 1 Samuel (35), Genesis (48), Ezekiel (41); the occurrences in Judges (21 times), 2 Samuel (21), 1 Kings (26), 2 Kings (26), and Psalms (36) correspond to the average. In the remaining books the values are in part considerably below average.

Several hitherto unnoticed irregularities in the distribution should be mentioned because, given the relative frequency of this root (*śîm* is one of the 25 most frequent OT verbs), they are probably not just accidental, though at this point one can at most offer only a tentative explanation. In P^{G2} *śîm* occurs only in Gen. 6:16, but it then occurs about 40 times in P^S, frequently in cultic and building instructions or in corresponding accounts of the actual execution (never, however, used thus in 1 K. 6–7). The term *śîm* occurs only 3 times in Proverbs, and not at all in 10:1–22:16. One might conclude that a "technical" semantic element attaches to *śîm* but that it occurs as a specialized term only in certain traditions. Its particular concentration in Deutero-Isaiah and Job, however, and its absence in early wisdom writings rather suggest that a certain solemn, poetic coloring attaches to the root. Yet the many occurrences in the prose of Genesis and 1 Samuel seem to militate against this view. The term *śîm* does, in any event, strikingly recede in late writings, including Ezra and Nehemiah (twice each), 1 Chronicles (7), and 2 Chronicles (10). Moreover, in 13 of 17 occurrences in Chronicles, *śîm* has been taken from the Dtr source document (exceptions include 1 Ch. 26:10; 2 Ch. 1:5; 6:20 [different in 1 K. 8:29]; 33:14); in isolated instances Chronicles alters *śîm* in its source document (*hyh:* 2 Ch. 7:16 [cf. 1 K. 9:3]; 33:4 [cf. 2 K. 21:4]; *ntn:* 2 Ch. 9:8 [cf. 1 K. 10:9]). Studies of the language of Chronicles do

---

Bibl 1 (1920) 353-71; C. J. Labuschagne, "נתן *ntn* to give," *TLOT*, II, 774-91; G. Langer, *Von gott erwählt-Jerusalem. Die Rezeption von Dtn 12 im frühen Judentum. Österreichische biblische Studien* 8 (Klosterneuburg, 1989); S. Layton, "Biblical Hebrew 'To Set the Face,' in Light of Akkadian and Ugaritic," *UF* 17 (1987) 169-81; R. Mach and J. H. Marks, "The Head upon the Knees: A Note on i Kings 18:42," *The World of Islam. FS P. K. Hitti* (London, 1960) 68-73; C. Maurer, "τίθημι κτλ.," *TDNT*, VIII, 152-68; S. D. McBride, "The Deuteronomic Name Theology" (diss., Harvard, 1969); T. Nöldeke, "Untersuchungen zur semitischen Grammatik," *ZDMG* 37 (1883) 525-40; S. M. Paul, "Unrecognized Biblical Legal Idioms in the Light of Comparative Akkadian Expressions," *RB* 86 (1979) 231-39; W. Richter, *Untersuchungen zur Valenz althebräischer Verben 1. 'RK. ATS* 23 (1985); I. Scheftelowitz, "Arisches im AT I" (diss., Königsberg, 1901); J. Schreiner, "Gottes Verfügen durch 'Geben' und 'Nehmen' in der Sicht der Psalmen," *Ein Gott, eine Offenbarung. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese, Theologie und Spiritualität. FS N Füglister* (Würzburg, 1991), 307-31; G. Vanoni, *Literarkritik und Grammatik. Untersuchung der Wiederholungen und Spannungen in 1 Kön 11–12. ATS* 21 (1984). → נתן *nāṯan,* X, 90-108.

1. See *TLOT*, III, 1444-45 (table 3).

2. See N. Lohfink, "The Priestly Narrative and History," *Theology of the Pentateuch* (Eng. trans. Minneapolis, 1994), 145 with n. 29.

not yield any information about retrograde vocabulary shifts.[3] Statistics of the Aramaic translations of *śîm* in the early versions make clear that it is only in East Aramaic (Syriac) that *sym* corresponds to Heb. *śîm,* whereas *šw'* predominates in West Aramaic (Tgs.).[4] Coxon's observations also concur with these findings.[5] West Aramaic influence on the language of Chronicles might explain the sparse occurrences of *śîm.*

Codex L contains the qal of *śîm* 582 times (including Dnl. 11:18 *Q;* concordances fail to include 2 Ch. 1:5),[6] the hiphil 3 times (Ezk. 14:8; 21:21[Eng. 16]; Job 4:20), the hophal once (Gen. 24:33), the subst. *t^e^śûmâ* once (Lev. 5:21), the PN *y^e^śîmi'ēl* once (1 Ch. 4:36[7]). Biblical Aramaic attests the peal of *śîm* 26 times, the hithpeel 3 times.

2. *Early Versions.* In addition to a single, primary term for rendering *śîm* (in over half of all occurrences), the early versions generally use a broad palette of translations. The LXX uses over 30 different roots, including *-tith-* (330), *-tass-* (42), *poie-* (37), *-ball-* (35), *-istan-* (31), *didon-* (26), *stēriz-* (13), *-ech-* (5), *epikal-* (4); the Tgs. use over 25 verbs, including *šw'* (431), *mn'* (44), *šr'* (9), *qbl* (9), *mn'* (6), *sym* (6), *tqn* (6), *'bd* (5); the Pesh. uses over 55 verbs, including *sym* (270), *'bd* (145), *rmy* (30), *qwm* (20); the Vg. uses over 60 roots, including *-pon-* (393), *fac-* (29), *-stat-* (29), *mitt-* (12), and *-dare* (11).

3. *Etymology.* The root *śîm*[8] is attested in all the Semitic languages (here only meanings deviating from the Hebrew are noted):

(a) Can., Phoen., Pun., Yaudi *šym;* Middle Heb. *śîmâ,* "lay," *sym* piel, "determine, designate";[9]

(b) Aramaic: Old, Imperial, Egyptian Aram. *śîm;* Jewish Aram., Sam., Syr. *sym;* Mandaic;[10]

(c) Akk. *šiāmu,* "fix, establish, ordain";[11]

---

3. See R. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose. HSM* 12 (1976).

4. See I.2 below.

5. Coxon, 498-500; see I.3 below.

6. Even-Shoshan, 1138, lists Ezk. 21:24(19) twice.

7. Cf. *IPN,* 202: "May God . . . firmly place"; an indicative translation can also be considered; cf. J. D. Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew: A Comparative Study. JSOTSup* 49 (1988), 99; concerning the inserted *-i-,* see *IPN,* 36.

8. On the classification as medial-*y,* see Nöldeke, 532.

9. For Canaanite, etc., see J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik. AnOr* 46 ([2]1970), §166; M.-J. Fuentes Estañol, *Vocabulario Fenicio* (Barcelona, 1980), 237; *DNSI,* II, 1126-27; *KAI,* III, 24. On Middle Hebrew see *ANH,* 285, 410.

10. For the earlier Aramaic see *KAI,* III, 43; *DNSI,* II, 1126-27; *AP,* 312; Beyer, 707. For Syriac see *LexSyr,* 469ff. For Mandaic see *MdD,* 321. On the absence of *śîm* in Palmyrene and Nabatean, see Coxon, 498 (see I.1 above).

11. *AHw,* III, 1225; *CAD,* XVII/1, 358-64: *šâmu* B.

(d) South Semitic: Arab. *šāma (šym),* "insert"; OSA *šym,* "install, erect, set up"; *šym,* "patron"; *mšm,* "field"; Eth. *šēma.*[12]

Although the root *śîm* is common to all Semitic languages,[13] it does not play the same role in all those languages as it does in Hebrew. Semantic equivalents to *śîm* include Akk. *šakānu* and Arab. *waḍaʿa.*[14]

4. *Homonyms.* In the case of a few difficult passages, interpreters have postulated homonyms. (a) *śîm* after the fashion of Arab. *šaʾama,* "be fateful, to the left": Ezk. 21:21(16);[15] 2 S. 13:32;[16] (b) *śîm/śmm/smm* hiphil ("paint the face, color") in 2 K. 9:30; Job 13:27; 33:11,[17] though one can understand the passages without the homonym hypothesis as well; indeed, the passages in Job can be more easily understood thus.[18]

5. *Textual Criticism.* Apart from the passages just discussed, the text of other passages prompts discussion, including:

Gen. 24:33 *K;* 50:26: generally *śîm* hophal is read with *Q* or Sam.; *K* does not require derivation from *yśm* and can be understood as *śîm* qal passive.[19]

Ex. 8:19(23): *BHS* and others emend the obj. *p^eḏuṯ* with *śîm* to *p^eluṯ* following LXX *diastolḗ,* though MT itself still yields an acceptable meaning.[20]

---

12. On Arabic cf. Nöldeke, 532; G. Bergsträsser, *Intro. to the Semitic Languages* (Eng. trans., Winona Lake, Ind., 1983), 216-17. On OSA see ContiRossini, 248-49; Biella, 515-16; Beeston, 136; W. W. Müller, "Die Wurzeln mediae und tertiae *y/w* im Altsüdarabischen" (diss., Tübingen, 1962), 71, with reference to PNs in Lihyanic, Safaitic, and Thamudic. On Ethiopic see *LexLingAeth,* 261-62; W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 539-40; additional documentation in *HAL,* III, 1321-22.

13. Cf. Bergsträssser, *Intro.,* 216-17; *LexHebAram,* 797.

14. On the Akkadian see *AHw,* III, 1134-39; *CAD,* XVII/1, 116-57; cf. McBride, 205; analogous: Ugar. *škn;* cf. *WUS,* no. 2606. On the Arabic see L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 9 (1959) 276.

15. J. Fürst, *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT* (Leipzig, ³1876), II, 423-24: "direct to the left," glossed by *hśmyly,* though *hśymy* is generally classified as dittography, cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 430. The interpretive attempts of G. R. Driver merely show how uncertain the textual basis is; he initially believes that the context requires a "verb of destruction" and suspects *šmm* hiphil ("Linguistic and Textual Problems: Ezekiel," *Bibl* 19 [1938] 68), then later reads *śîm* hophal in the fashion of Arab. *šāma,* "unsheathe, draw out of the sheath" ("Ezekiel: Linguistic and Textual Problems," *Bibl* 35 [1954] 154).

16. A. Schulz, *Die Bücher Samuel. EHAT* VIII/2 (1920), 145, subst. "disaster, misfortune"; *BDB,* 965: subst. "token of unluckiness"; C. Siegfried and B. Stade, *Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1893), 750, reckon with a subst. instead of a ptcp.; *LexHebAram,* 795, and Fürst, II, 424, the latter managing without a homonym: "at the behest of Absalom there was a decree," similarly also *RHB,* III, 304; cf. Akk. *šīmtu* from *šiāmu,* "destiny, fate"; *AHw,* III, 1238-39; cf. *CAD,* XVII/1, 363.

17. *HAL,* II, 760a, 1326a; cf. also G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 238-39.

18. Cf. the discussion in R. Gradwohl, *Die Farben im AT. BZAW* 83 (1963), 63-64; *RHB,* VII, 300, understands *śîm* as a synonym of *ʿśh,* "cosmetic operation on the eyelids."

19. Contra *GesB,* 321; Nöldeke, 532, et al. Cf. *GK,* §§73-74; Bergsträsser, II, §28s.

20. See H. Cazelles, "Rédactions et traditions dans l'Exode," *Studien zum Pentateuch. FS*

Nu. 24:23: emendations have been suggested for *miśśumô 'ēl,*[21] though a neutral understanding of the enclitic pronoun does enable the MT to yield a meaningful sentence, "Alas, who shall live when God does this?" (NRSV).

1 S. 22:7: read *ûlᵉkullᵉkem* with LXX and most comms., since *lᵉkullᵉkem* is difficult to understand as a dir. obj. of *śîm* and is meaningless as an indirect object.[22]

2 S. 22:44: *šmr* is often emended to *śîm* with Ps. 18:44(43). G. Schmuttermayr considers the reading of Ps. 18 to be reliable and suspects that the verb in the version in Samuel represents the remnants of a stichos intended to be synonymous with the first half-verse. D. Barthélemy finds *śîm* already in the LXX source document, though the latter may well already have been accommodated to Ps. 18.[23]

2 K. 8:11: Vg. is generally followed in emending *śîm* to *šmm,* "tremble"; cf. *BHS.* MT is comprehensible if *pānāyw* from the preceding clause is understood as the object.[24]

Isa. 28:25: the meanings of *śôrâ* and *nismān* are disputed, and the terms are usually deleted as glosses.[25]

Isa. 44:7: separating words differently, scholars since Oort's study have generally conjectured *mî hišmîa' mē'ôlām,* though the MT itself, supported by 1QIsaª, is not entirely incomprehensible.[26]

Isa. 53:10: following Houbigant, interpreters generally emend *tāśîm* to *tuśam.*[27] The following possibilities emerge for the MT: the reflexive *napšô* is simultaneously subject and object; the gender of the reflexive object influences the subject as well; or the *t-* prefix is masculine.[28]

Isa. 61:3: the *śîm* phrase looks suspiciously like doubling, which is why some interpreters delete it while others emend it.[29] MT remains difficult; cf., e.g., "to determine

---

W. Kornfeld (Vienna, 1977), 46 n. 32. Cf. *KD,* in loc.; *TOB,* "I will make a gesture of liberation to separate"; → XI, 486.

21. *BHS;* M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (1968), in loc., reads *miśśᵉmō'l;* E. Nestle, "Miscellen [Agag und Samuel in den Sprüchen des Bileam]," *ZAW* 28 (1908) 228; Codex Jericho et al. attest no word separation: *miššᵉmû'ēl.*

22. On direct object see A. Schulz, *Die Bücher Samuel. EHAT* VIII/1 (1919), 330; cf. *GK* §117n. On indirect object see H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 409.

23. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1322b; G. Schmuttermayr, *Psalm 18 und 2 Samuel 22. SANT* 25 (1971), 172-74; D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT. OBO* 50/1 (1982), 309.

24. See the discussion in M. Rehm, *Das zweite Buch der Könige* (Würzburg, 1982), 83.

25. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. trans. 2002), 49; S. C. Thexton, "A Note on Isaiah xxvii 25 and 28," *VT* 2 (1952) 82, reads *śûmâ* instead of *śôrâ:* "He sets the wheat [he is] set upon [growing]." For a discussion of other possibilities, cf. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT. OBO* 50/2 (1986), 198-200.

26. H. Oort, *Textus Hebraici emendationes* (Leiden, 1900); cf. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 396. See Barthélemy, *Critique,* II, 326-28; and TOB, "since I have established the multitude."

27. C. F. Houbigant, *Notae criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros cum hebraice* (Frankfurt, 1777); cf. *BHS;* a different view is taken by *HAL,* III, 1323a, 1325.

28. Cf. the discussion in Vanoni, 197; Barthélemy, *Critique,* II, 402-3; Richter, 110-15.

29. Deleting: B. Duhm, *Jesaja. HKAT* III/1 (1902), 455. Emending: C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 364: *lᵉśammaḥ; RHB,* IV, 217: *lāšûḇ.*

those who mourn in Zion, that one might give them," or the addition of the obj. "garland" from the following phrase.[30]

Ezk. 14:8: the hiphil is generally emended to qal.[31]

Ezk. 17:5: some interpreters delete the difficult *qāḥ* as "vertical dittography";[32] this particular sentence construction remains difficult.

Am. 7:8: construing the hapax legomenon *ʾᵃnāḵ* as "crowbar" requires emending the locative *bᵉqereḇ*.[33] W. Beyerlin argues convincingly contra "plumb"/"crowbar" in favor of "tin," viewing the tin that was set in the midst of the people as the irresistible invading force willed and guided by God. C. Uehlinger follows Beyerlin and draws attention to the ambivalence of tin in the sense of hardness and weakness.[34]

Ob. 4: either the unwieldy participial construction is deleted entirely, or *śîm* is emended to *tāśîm,* whereby *qinneḵā* functions as the object of the first sentence as well.[35]

Ob. 7: concerning the problems of sentence demarcation and vocalization, see J. Wehrle; concerning the suggestion that one read the perfect instead of the imperfect (contra *BHS*), see Wolff.[36]

Nah. 1:14: the emendation *ʾaššîm,* "I desecrate (your grave)," is not necessary.[37]

Hab. 1:11: instead of MT *wᵉʾāšēm,* interpreters often follow 1QpHab 4:9 and read *wᵉyāśēm;* by contrast, W. Rudolph reads *wayyaššēm*.[38]

Ps. 50:23: following Graetz, many emend *wᵉśām* to *wᵉṯam;* the MT is comprehensible as breviloquence for *wᵉśām ʿal-libbô dereḵ*.[39]

Ps. 85:14(13): *wᵉyōšer* or *šālôm* have been conjectured for *wᵉyāśēm;* the translation

---

30. Fürst, II, 423; TOB.

31. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* in loc.; *HAL,* III, 1325b.

32. See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* in loc.; for an explanation of MT see G. R. Driver, *Bibl* 35 (1954) 152-53.

33. K. Budde, "Zu Text und Auslegung des Buches Amos IX: 7:1-9," *JBL* 44 (1925) 76: *bᵉqirōṯ;* cf. the discussion in W. Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 234-35.

34. W. Beyerlin, *Bleilot, Brecheisen oder was sonst? Revision einer Amos-Vision. OBO* 81 (1988) 35; C. Uehlinger, "Der Herr auf der Zinnmauer. Zur dritten Amos-Vision (Am 7:7-8)," *BN* 48 (1989) 89-104.

35. E.g., H. W. Wolff, *Obadiah and Jonah. CC* (Eng. trans. 1986), in loc. See W. Richter, *Untersuchungen zur Valenz althebräischer Verben,* II: *GBH, ʿMQ, QṢR II. ATS* 25 (1986), 96-97.

36. J. Wehrle, *Prophetie und Textanalyse. Die Komposition Obadja 1–21 interpretiert auf der Basis textlinguistischer und semiotischer Konzeptionen. ATS* 28 (1987), 77-78; Wolff, *Obadiah,* in loc.

37. *HAL,* III, 1325b, with bibliog.

38. See ibid.; W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 205, reads *wayyaššēm.*

39. H. Graetz, *Kritischer Commentar zu den Psalmen* (Breslau, 1882); H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 220; *HAL,* III, 1325b. Cf. recently F.-L. Hossfeld, "Ps 50 und die Verkündigung des Gottesrechts," *Ein Gott, eine Offenbarung. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese, Theologie und Spiritualität. FS N. Füglister* (Würzburg, 1991), 84; M. Dahood, *Psalms I: 1–50. AB* 16 (1965), 310, reads the qal pass. ptcp. of *śîm,* "who is set in my way."

in TOB, "and his steps trace the path," and the suggestions collected by C. Locher make textual emendation superfluous.[40]

Job 4:20: alterations to *šēm* or *môšîaʿ* are unnecessary if *mēśîm* is understood as the subst. "paying attention"; the qal ptcp. is perhaps possible.[41]

Job 34:23: *ʿôḏ* is generally changed by the addition of *m,* which disappeared through haplography, into the obj. *môʿēḏ;* the MT is comprehensible assuming an ellipse of *lēḇ*.[42]

Job 36:13: emendations from *śîm* to *šmr* or *nšm* are unnecessary; Fohrer understands the MT as meaning "nurture anger/resentment," while Ehrlich reads "the people of ruthless disposition presuppose anger in God."[43]

Job 41:23(31): a congruence of metaphors is present even without a revocalization of *śîm* to an otherwise unattested OT *nšm* hiphil;[44] cf. TOB, which understands the rare *merqāḥâ* as an "incense vessel."

Cant. 6:12: the "most difficult verse" in Canticles has been subject to widely varying emendations; O. Keel's translation and explanation are plausible: "my desire set me in the chariots of Amminadab."[45]

Eccl. 3:18: the term *šām* postulated before *hāʾᵉlōhîm* is not necessary for understanding MT.[46]

Ezra 10:44: often emended for reasons of content following 3 Ezra 9:36; *śîm* as "to bear children" is possible in analogy to Arab. *waḍaʿa.*[47]

2 Ch. 1:5: the reading *śām* in Codex L is attested quite poorly; Barthélemy finds evidence of theological scruples behind this situation and hence gives *šām* preference.[48]

On the whole, then, the occurrences of *śîm* are textually quite reliable. The passages using the hiphil remain difficult, particularly because the hophal occurrences can be interpreted as qal passives. Grammatical studies vacillate between rejecting the hiphil forms and assuming the presence of a pseudo-hiphil.[49]

II. 1. *Expressions.* With the vb. *śîm,* forms relating perfective circumstances (pf. 104 times, impf. consec. 156 times) predominate over imperfective forms (impf. 71, pf.

---

40. See *HAL,* III, 1325b. Cf. C. Locher, "Der Psalter der 'Einheitsübersetzung' und die Textkritik," *Bibl* 59 (1978) 64.

41. For the former see N. Herz, "Some Difficult Passages in Job," *ZAW* 20 (1900) 160; cf. F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (⁴1983), 61. For the latter cf. Fohrer, 131; *HAL,* III, 1325b.

42. For the former cf. *BHS; HAL,* III, 1325a. For the latter, cf. *GesB,* 784; TOB, "he does not need to watch the person for a long time."

43. See *HAL,* III, 1325b; Fohrer, 471; *RHB,* VI, 322.

44. So Dahood, *Bibl* 53 (1972) 400, with bibliog.

45. See W. Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth; Das Hohelied; Die Klagelieder. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 166; O. Keel, *Song of Songs. CC* (Eng. trans. 1994), 225-28.

46. K. Galling, *Der Prediger. HAT* I/18 (²1969), 96; cf. the discussion in A. Lauha, *Kohelet. BK* XIX (1978), 72-73, 75.

47. See *HAL,* III, 1325b. Cf. L. Kopf, *VT* 9 (1959) 276; a different view is taken by Barthélemy, *Critique,* I, 547: "(of whom) they had children."

48. Barthélemy, *Critique,* I, 474-75.

49. Hiphil: Nöldeke, 530; *HAL,* III, 1325. Cf. *LexHebAram,* 797, with bibliog.

consec. 87); these numbers do not include appellative forms (impv. 57, jussive 9, cohortative 34, vetitive 5, prohibitive 7). The infinitive construct occurs 38 times,[50] the infinitive absolute 3 times, and the participle 15 times. The hapax substantive (Lev. 5:21) is attested in the construct expression *tᵉśûmeṯ yāḏ* (allegedly a loan that, unlike the *piqqāḏôn,* may be used up and replaced[51]). The subject of *śîm* is always animate and includes people (392 times), deities (176), and animals (Ezk. 17:4,5; 19:5; Joel 1:7; Job 41:23[31]; Prov. 30:26), Satan (Job 1:8; 2:3), and *nepeš* (Cant. 6:12; Isa. 53:10). Additional syntagmas include direct (generally "affected," altered) objects (inanimate: 186 times; people: 100; parts of the body or anthropological expressions: 123; deity: 6 [cf. Ps. 40:5(4)]; animal: 3; nature: 21; abstraction or circumstances: 132; 60 occurrences use *'eṯ,* 3 use *min* [Dt. 17:15; Ps. 105:21; Isa. 25:2], *lᵉ* once [1 S. 22:7; text?]), direct (generally "effected," created) objects (inanimate: 39 times; abstraction: 30; nature: 26 [Ex. 14:21]; people: 19 [cf. Gen. 21:13]; animal: 4 [cf. Ezk. 19:5]; parts of the body: 3; deity: once [Jgs. 8:3]; in most cases the second object is added prepositionally: 58 times with *lᵉ,* 25 with *kᵉ*), indirect object (people: 31 times; deity: 3; inanimate objects or places: 5; *lᵉ* is used 35 times, *'al* 5 times); prepositional objects are used to designate "locale," sometimes figuratively (people: 90 times; parts of the body: 84; inanimate objects: 75; abstractions: 93; deity: twice [Job 5:8; Ps. 78:7]; animals: 4 [cf. 1 S. 25:18]; nature: twice; prepositions with a primarily locative semantic coloring predominate: *'al* 125 times; *bᵉ* 117; *lᵉ* 25; *'el* 21; *lipnê* 11; *bên* 9; *taḥaṯ* 7; *negeḏ* 3;[52] others: 10; *šām:* 17).

The transition from the fixed to a free syntagma cannot always be easily determined. An infinitive group is often still part of the sentence core, e.g., when someone is "installed/appointed in order to do something" (1 S. 8:5; 1 K. 10:9; Ps. 105:21) or when something is "done so that something will thereby happen" (2 K. 13:7; Isa. 51:10; Ezk. 21:24,25[19,21]; cf. Ezra 8:17). An infinitive group can replace the object (in Gen. 24:33, "then food was set before him to eat") or the prepositional object, especially in idiomatic expressions with parts of the body as the object that express intent (1 K. 2:15; 2 K. 12:18[17]; Jer. 42:15,17; 44:12; Dnl. 11:17; cf. Job 34:23; Mal. 2:2) or refusal (*min:* Zech. 7:12). The infinitive can also designate the intent or effect (positively in Jer. 7:30; Ezk. 30:21; negatively in Gen. 4:15) or the course (*lē'mōr:* Ex. 9:5; Dt. 22:17). These infinitive functions can also be taken over by either an independent (Ex. 18:21; Prov. 8:29) or a dependent (Ex. 21:13; Dt. 22:8; 31:19; Ps. 104:9; Dnl. 1:8) clause. Twelve passages use a "pertinence amplification" *(ethicus)* as a free syntagma (cf. Josh. 8:2). Prepositional groups can further specify the place (cf. Gen. 50:26; Hag. 2:15) or the time of the action (cf. 1 S. 30:25; 2 K. 21:7; with inf.: 1 S. 15:2). Prepositional phrases with *kᵉ* introduce comparatives (cf. Dt. 17:14; 1 S. 8:5, "like [as] all nations [are governed]," or "as is the custom with all nations").[53] An infinitive absolute (Dt. 17:15; Jer. 42:15) lends emphasis to the sentence.

---

50. On these forms see JM, 436-37 (§124l).

51. See *RHB,* II, 19.

52. See H. Bardtke, "Die hebräische Präposition neged in den Psalmen," *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruche. FS J. Ziegler. FzB* 2 (1972), 25.

53. See in this regard Jenni, 144.

Even at the level of such expressions, *śîm* already emerges as a popular theological expression. Direct statements about God (subj. or obj.) are found in 190 occurrences (a third), to which one can then add about 130 occurrences (a fifth) in theological and cultic contexts. A particular concentration of such theological use is found in the Psalms (30 of 36 times), Isaiah (30 of 54), Job (20 of 40), the Minor Prophets (25 of 50), and Jeremiah (17 of 37). By contrast, no such theological usage is found in Biblical Aramaic. The various lexicons provide addition documentation concerning the use of *śîm* in different expressions.[54]

2. *Word Field.* The immediate word field of *śîm* includes the following synonymous verbs as parallels: *ntn* (Gen. 21:14; 27:37; 41:42; Ex. 26:35; 29:6; 39:19-20; 40:5-6,8,18,20,30; Lev. 2:15; 5:11; 8:8,26; 10:1; Nu. 4:14; 16:7,18; 17:11[16:46]; Dt. 7:15; 17:15; Josh. 7:19; 1 S. 6:8; 22:7; 1 K. 2:5; 12:29; 18:23; 2 K. 18:14; Ps. 66:9; 79:1; Isa. 41:19; 61:3; Ezk. 4:2; 17:5; 20:28; 30:21; 35:3-4; Hos. 11:8),[55] *lqḥ* (Gen. 9:23; 21:14; 22:6; 28:11,18; 31:34; Ex. 2:3; 17:12; 24:6; Lev. 8:26; 10:1; Nu. 16:18; 17:11[16:46]; Dt. 26:2; 31:26; Josh. 7:11; 8:12; Jgs. 4:21; 1 S. 7:12; 8:11; 19:13; 25:18; 1 K. 20:6; 2 K. 4:29; 9:13; 20:7; Job 22:22; Isa. 51:22-23; Jer. 43:10; Ezk. 17:5; 19:5; Hag. 2:23), *hyh* (Gen. 28:22; Ex. 4:15; 28:37; Dt. 10:5; 11:18; 31:26; Ezk. 24:7; 35:4), *šyt* (Gen. 30:40-41; 48:17-18; Jer. 13:16; 31:21; Hos. 2:5[3]), *bw'* hiphil (Ex. 40:21; 1 S. 17:54; Ps. 66:11; Ezk. 17:4), *swr* hiphil (Gen. 48:17-18; Dt. 7:15; 1 S. 18:13; 1 K. 20:24), *'śh* (Gen. 6:16; Ps. 104:3-4; Ezk. 7:20), *qwm* hiphil (Ex. 40:2-3,18; Ps. 78:5), *nś'* (Jgs. 9:48; Job 13:14; Est. 3:1), *ysd* (Ps. 104:8-9; Hab. 1:12), *rwm* hiphil (Lev. 6:3[10]; 1 S. 9:24), *nṣb* (Jer. 31:21), *'md* hiphil (2 K. 8:11), *nṭh* (Job 38:5).

Alongside these verbs with relatively nonspecific meanings, the immediate context of *śîm* includes additional verbs generally concurring semantically with the objects of *śîm* and thus qualifying more specifically the connotations attaching to the rather general nature of *śîm*,[56] including *lbš* (Gen. 41:42; Job 38:9; Isa. 50:3; Zech. 3:5; connotation: "put on, array"), *'kl* (Gen. 24:33; 43:32; 1 S. 9:24; 28:22; 2 S. 12:20; 2 K. 6:22: "set before"), *špk* (Ezk. 4:2; 21:27[22]; 24:7: "liquid" (whereas van Dijk assumes the presence of a "connotation" in these expressions, Labuschagne is already speaking about a "meaning"[57]), *nsk* (Ezk. 20:28), *zrq* (Ex. 24:6: "liquid"; Isa. 28:25: "granular"), *qšr* (Dt. 11:18: "fasten, secure"), *ḥgr* (1 K. 20:31-32), *ḥbš* (Ezk. 24:17; 30:21), *tq'* (1 S. 31:10; 1 Ch. 10:10: "violent"), *nqb* (Job 40:26[41:2]).

Other verbs appear only in the context of certain idiomatic expressions with *śîm*, where they qualify the meaning further: "intellectual activity" (*yd':* Isa. 41:20,22; *byn:* Neh. 8:8; Isa. 57:1; *śkl:* Isa. 41:20; *zkr:* 2 S. 19:20[19]; Isa. 47:7; 57:11; *šm':* Ezk. 40:4; Zech. 7:12; Mal. 2:2; connotation: "pay attention to"); "messenger commission" (*nb'* + messenger formula: Ezk. 6:2; 13:17; 21:2,7[20:46; 21:2]; 25:2; 28:21; 29:2; 35:2; 38:2; all except Ezk. 13:17 also use the word-event formula *hyh* + *d^e^bar yhwh;* conno-

54. See also Vanoni, 139-41, 197-200.
55. See Schreiner, 311.
56. See II.3 below.
57. Labuschagne, 777.

tation: "speak against"); "fall silent" (*ḥrš:* Mic. 7:16; *bwš:* 2 K. 8:11; Isa. 50:7; Mic. 7:16; *kzb:* Job 24:25); "disastrous deed" (*'bd:* 2 K. 13:7; Zeph. 2:13; *šbt* hiphil: Ezk. 26:12; Hos. 2:14[12]; *krt* hiphil: Jer. 44:11; *šmd* hiphil: Isa. 13:9; *šmm* hiphil: Job 21:5; Hos. 2:14[12]; *pšḥ:* Lam. 3:11), "trust" (*bṭḥ:* Job 31:24; Ps. 40:5[4]; 52:9[7]; Jer. 17:5; *'mn* hiphil: Job 4:18; connotation: "set upon"); "unity" (*qbṣ:* Hos. 2:2[1:11]; Mic. 2:12; Zeph. 3:19; connotation: "together").

In individual cases, precise connotations emerge; examples include "to present" in the sense of "to have validated" (Job 5:8: *drš*[58]) or "put into a certain condition" in the sense of "able to tread upon the high places" (Hab. 3:19: *drk*).

Finally, approximations of the contextual meaning of *śîm* also emerge from parallel sentences using negation and a verb that in some fashion functions as an antonym (cf. Ex. 5:8; Job 4:18; Ps. 40:5[4]; 52:9[7]; 54:5[3]; 66:9; 78:7; 86:14; Isa. 50:7; 59:21; Jer. 21:10; 39:12; Am. 9:4).

3. *Meaning.* a. *Basic Considerations.* The widely varying translations of *śîm* in the early versions correspond to an even more comprehensive list of meanings in the lexicons (*HAL* has the most, with twenty-one main and many more submeanings as well as numerous cross references among the various entries), albeit with the difference that in the versions the majority of occurrences are generally covered by a single, primary rendering.[59]

An even partially consistent translation of *śîm* into the European languages is impossible not least because there are no full equivalents, e.g., for Gk. *títhēmi* (Old High German may be an exception, where *tuon* covers the meaning of both "do" and "make"[60]). The plethora of translation suggestions in the various lexicons, however, also derives from the variously restricted selections of idioms in the prevailing translation languages.[61] The example of the expression *śîm pānîm* demonstrates this situation. Lev. 20:5 and Jer. 21:10 are variously translated "to set one's face against"; German: "sein Angesicht richten/wenden [not: setzen/legen] [i.e., to 'direct/turn' one's face, not 'set/put'] auf/gegen"; French: "tourner sa face contre, diriger son regard vers"; Italian: "poner/volver su cara contra." Once an infinitive enters the expression (Jer. 42:15), these idioms no longer fit: "to be bent on"; German: "sich versteifen auf, sich in den Kopf setzen"; French: "se mettre en route pour." Hence the verbs are by no means simply interchangeable. This situation is quite different in Hebrew, where some expressions can use *ntn, śîm,* or *šîṯ*.[62] Additional translation problems emerge with the contextual deletion of objects (esp. in the case of the impv.) and with idiomatic breviloquence (e.g., in the case of *śîm lēḇ*). Hebrew presents cases that are difficult to

58. On the legal connotation of Akk. *awātam šakānu* as an equivalent to the hapax legomenon *śîm* + *diḇrâ,* see Paul, 235-36.

59. See I.2 above.

60. See F. Kluge, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* (Berlin, [20]1967), 796-97, s.v. *tun.*

61. Bibliog. in Vanoni, 157-58 n. 489.

62. → X, 93; also II.3.c-d below.

conceive in other languages. Whereas, for example, the context makes elliptical commands such as "put!" or "set!" unequivocal in English despite any lexical ambiguity, no analogous breviloquence is possible in German, e.g., "greift!" (reach, grab!) (for "angreifen!" [attack!] or "begreift!" [understand!]). Many of the textual problems discussed above can be reduced to translation problems.[63]

b. *Syntax.* Rather than further discussing stylistic questions here, I will try to illuminate the meaning of *śîm* on the basis of the internal Hebrew textual evidence itself. Taking the verb's ability to enter into certain expressions as the point of departure, syntactical structures emerge corresponding, in the realm of content, to various semantic classes.[64] The following discussion does not take uncertain passages into account.

The basic nature of the vb. *śîm* follows a tripartite schema, since occurrences with a subject, a direct object, and an additional syntagma clearly predominate (515 = 88%), including the 70 occurrences with a contextual deletion of the direct object (e.g., Ex. 17:12: "so they took a stone and put [it] under him"). The nature of the second dependent syntagma allows a further breakdown.[65] In most instances it is a prepositional object or an adverb (Gen. 2:8) with a locative connotation (345 times = 59%, 120 of which use the prep. *'al,* 115 *bᵉ*), which is why this context probably represents the primary use of *śîm* (e.g., Gen. 43:22: "We do not know who put our money in our sacks"). The other uses are secondary. The second dependent syntagma refers to the "effected" (created) object (141 times = 24%; e.g., Gen. 21:18: "I will make a great nation of him") or to the indirect object (29 times = 5%; e.g., Ex. 4:11: "Who gives/made speech to/for mortals?").

The occurrences with only a single dependent syntagma (39 times = 7%) can be understood as variations of the use just described (e.g., Nu. 17:11[16:46]: "lay incense"). Here too locative use predominates, so that one must reckon with contextual (because the reference is obvious) or lexical deletion of the indication of place, especially since lower syntactical importance does not necessarily mean lower semantic importance (Jgs. 12).[66] In sentences such as Ex. 40:18 ("he set up its [the tabernacle's] frames"), the enclitic pronoun functions perhaps as a substitute for the locative information. The rare (23 occurrences = 4%) passages with more than two dependent syntagmas can be otherwise explained as combinations of the simpler sentence types (e.g., 2 K. 4:10: "let us put there for him a bed" corresponds to "let us put a bed there" + "let us give him a bed").

Scholars have long recognized that with verbs exhibiting this tripartite schema, the dependent syntagmas are in fact related in the fashion of a nominal clause.[67] The verbal

---

63. See I.5 above.

64. Underlying theoretical considerations in Richter, *Untersuchungen 1,* 10-25; cf. also Vanoni (index "Syntagmen," "Verbalsatz-Typen," "Verbgruppen").

65. See also II.1 above.

66. Richter, *Untersuchungen 1,* 12.

67. W. Richter, *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik. Die Beschreibungsebenen. Der Satz (Satztheorie). ATS* 13 (1980), 101, 105, with bibliog.; Jenni, 139-40.

clause "I will make *(weśamtî)* your offspring like the dust of the earth" (Gen. 13:16) corresponds to the nominal clause "your offspring shall be like the dust of the earth" (Gen. 28:14); the verbal clause "he gave *(wayyāśem)* him the name Abimelech" (Jgs. 8:31, NRSV "named him") corresponds to the nominal clause "her name was Hagar" (Gen. 16:1); and the verbal clause "Israel put *(wayyāśem)* the Canaanites to forced labor *(lāmas)*" (Jgs. 1:28) corresponds to the nominal clause "the Canaanites became subject to forced labor" (Jgs. 1:30). In such cases *śîm* exhibits a "causal" semantic effect in the sense of "make the content expressed by the nominal clause come about/happen." This semantic effect is also present in cases where the syntagma corresponding to the subject in the nominal clause has been deleted ("set up, install, arrange": 1 S. 7:12; 2 S. 8:6,14; 1 K. 20:34; 2 K. 10:24; 1 Ch. 18:6,13), suggesting that the locatives are to be understood not as fixed syntagmas but as free indicators of circumstance (cf. also Gen. 6:16; 2 K. 10:8; Isa. 41:19; 43:19).

On the one hand, the combination of the verb's semantic effects ("causal," "locative") with the semantic characteristics of the dependent syntagmas and, on the other, the degree of metaphorical development allow the primary areas of use and the primary meanings of *śîm* to emerge.

(1) locative: about 240 times, primarily in the syntactical structures with a direct and possibly a prepositional object: "lay/place/put/set (on/in)" (Gen. 2:8);

(2) (intellectual) figurative: about 100 times, primarily in the same syntactical structures as (1): "direct/turn (attention) toward" (Gen. 31:21);

(3) factitive: about 130 times, especially in syntactical structures with double objects: "make into," etc. (Gen. 21:13);

(4) factitive-figurative: about 50 times, in all syntactical types: "insert, engage";

(5) special meanings (with certain classes of objects): "fix, secure, establish" (about 20 times; Gen. 47:26), "impose" (about 10 times; Ex. 5:8), "bring about, cause" (5 times; e.g., Jer. 32:20);

(6) substantival use.[68]

Classification must remain open for about 50 occurrences, since there is no corresponding material to test interchangeability. Caution is also advised when adducing extrabiblical materials to explain enumerated expressions in the lexicons.[69]

One example can demonstrate how positing special meanings for *śîm* can in some cases even completely miss the meaning of the original text. Some translations follow the LXX *(speírei)* or pick up on the par. *zrq* in reading "sow" in Isa. 28:25. The agricultural metaphor, however, contains several signals suggesting that the MT intends to evoke the notion of a careful, ordered "placing" of seeds rather than merely (superficial) scattering.[70]

In other cases the assumption of special meanings causes one to misunderstand cer-

---

68. See II.3.f below.

69. As is frequently the case in *HAL.*

70. See I.5 above; cf. J. C. Exum, "'Whom Will He Teach Knowledge?' A Literary Approach to Isaiah 28," in D. J. A. Clines, D. M. Gunn, and A. J. Hauser, eds., *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature. JSOTSup* 19 (1982), 129-30; Barthélemy, *Critique,* II, 200.

tain poetic functions.[71] For example, Dahood restricts the semantically open *śîm* in Job 22:22; 38:5,33; Ps. 56:9(8); Prov. 8:29 to "to trace, draft."[72] His suggestion is questionable not least because these passages contain not only differing sentence types but also disparate word fields, which is why the connotation (but not the meaning) "to write down" might at most be appropriate for only an individual passage.

One final consideration of significance is the distribution of occurrences using a divine subject in the main usage types. In the case of "insert, engage" (ratio 1:7), "locative" (1:6), and "(intellectual) figurative" (1:5), the statistics are far below the average, whereas in the case of "fix, establish, secure" (2:3) and "make" (2:3) they are considerably above the average. Although proportionately *śîm* (with a third of all theological occurrences[73]) exceeds the vb. *'śh* (with only a sixth of all theological occurrences),[74] it is itself eclipsed by *ntn,* which takes a divine subject in two-fifths of all cases.[75] In any event God is the most frequent subject that "sets, puts" (176 times; Moses is second with 37). The preference biblical authors have for using verbs such as *ntn, 'śh,* and *śîm* in theological contexts may derive from these verbs' greater flexibility and hence their more indeterminate meaning.[76]

c. *Idioms.* Various idiomatic expressions use *śîm,* especially in expressions referencing parts of the body and in anthropological expressions.

lēḇ/lēḇaḇ. The expression *śîm + ('eṯ) lēḇ/lēḇaḇ* (enclitic pronoun) + (prepositional phrase) involves figurative use with reference to focusing the heart as the organ of attentiveness, inclination, worry, memory, and cognition[77] on a person or thing (*'al:* Job 1:8; 2:3; Hag. 1:5,7; cf. Biblical Aramaic with *bāl:* Dnl. 6:15[14]; *'el:* Ex. 9:21; 1 S. 25:25; 2 S. 18:3;[78] theological context: Job 34:14; *l^e:* Dt. 32:46; 1 S. 9:20; Ezk. 40:4; 44:5; cf. also Isa. 41:22; Ezk. 44:5; Hag. 2:15,18 [Haggai exhibits a preference for the expression, using it in 5 of 7 occurrences of *śîm*]). In isolated passages the expression *śîm + 'al-lēḇ/lēḇaḇ* (enclitic pronoun) still exhibits the literal locative meaning, e.g., in Cant. 8:6, "Set me as a seal upon your 'heart'"; as in Ex. 28:29, *lēḇ* refers to the "breast." P. Joüon derives this figurative use from the literal use, suggesting that the expression implies the semantic nuance "unforgettable" through the connotation "precious object, preciousness."[79] O. Keel believes the seal worn on the breast functions as an amulet.[80] The literal locative meaning may also be present in Dt. 11:18, "You shall put these words of mine in your heart." The parallel expressions "on your hand" and

71. See II.4 below.
72. Dahood, *Bibl* 53 (1972) 399.
73. See II.1 above.
74. J. Vollmer, "עשׂה *'śh* to make, do," *TLOT* II, 944-45.
75. Schreiner, 312 with n. 14.
76. See Maurer, 154-55, on *títhēmi.*
77. → VII, 416-17, 420-21.
78. On the missing enclitic pronoun, see A. R. Müller, *Martin Bubers Verdeutschung der Schrift. ATS* 14 (1982), 32.
79. P. Joüon, "Locutions Hébraïques avec la préposition עַל devant לֵב, לֵבָב," *Bibl* 5 (1924) 49-50.
80. Keel, *Song,* 271-72.

"on your forehead" suggest the expression is to be understood as a locative (Keel takes a different view, suggesting the meaning "contemplation and striving"[81]). The remaining passages all use the term figuratively ("take to heart"): Isa. 42:25; 47:7; 57:1,11; Jer. 12:11; "be resolved": Dnl. 1:8; Mal. 2:2).[82] Variants of the expression include the use of *'el* (2 S. 13:33; 19:20[19]) and *b*ᵉ (1 S. 21:13[12]; Job 22:22).

rō'š. The expression *śîm* (with the variant *šîṯ* in Gen. 48:14,17) + *yāmîn* + enclitic pronoun + *'al-rō'š* (Gen. 48:18) refers to the gesture accompanying the blessing.[83] If the action refers to one's own head, it involves the rite of (self-)abasement:[84] *śîm* + *yāḏ* + enclitic pronoun + *'al-rō'š* expresses sorrow (2 S. 13:19; cf. the nominal clause in Jer. 2:37); *śîm* + *ḥᵃḇālîm* + *bᵉrō'š* expresses subordination (1 K. 20:31[85]). The expression *śîm* + head covering + *'al-rō'š* refers to the transfer of insignia when someone is installed in an office (priests: Ex. 29:6; Lev. 8:9; Zech. 3:5). The expression is also attested with *b*ᵉ and probably has the same meaning in Est. 2:17 (installation of the queen), though probably not in Zech. 6:11 (the golden crown for the high priest; some interpreters have suggested in analogy with *ntn lipnê* the meaning "place at one's disposal"[86]).

pānîm. The expression *śîm* (in part interchangeable with *ntn* and *šîṯ*) + *('eṯ) pānîm* + enclitic pronoun + indication of direction is attested in various forms.[87] In its ordinary formulation the expression refers to starting off in a certain direction (Gen. 31:21; Dnl. 11:18 *Q*[88]) or to resolving to do something (always with an inf. group: 2 K. 12:18[17]; Jer. 42:15,17; 44:12; Dnl. 11:17; cf. 1 K. 2 15[89]). With a human subject in prophetic contexts (e.g., Ezk. 6:2),[90] it can be viewed as a formula attesting the old notion that for a prophecy to come about, visual contact must be established between the prophet and the object of his prophecy, though this expression is also used in instances where such contact cannot in fact be realized (e.g., Ezk. 28:21).[91] It can also be considered formulaic when used with a divine subject and a prepositional object with *b*ᵉ (Lev. 20:5; Jer. 21:10; 44:11; Ezk. 15:7).[92] Such usage suggests the presence of a legal-sacral context (with *krt* hiphil: Lev. 20:5; Jer. 44:11), albeit not quite as clearly as does the (probably original) version with *ntn* (Lev. 17:10; 20:3,6; 26:17; Ezk. 14:8; 15:7), and always re-

---

81. O. Keel, "Zeichen der Verbundenheit," *FS D. Barthélemy. OBO* 38 (1981), 161.
82. See Dhorme, 124.
83. → VI, 101; → XIII, 252.
84. → XIII, 252.
85. See E. Kutsch, "'Trauerbräuche' und 'Selbstminderungsriten' im AT," in K. Lüthi, E. Kutsch, and W. Dantine, *Drei Wiener Antrittsreden. ThS* 78 (1965), 30 = *Kleine Schriften zum AT. BZAW* 168 (1986), 83; → IV, 173, 175.
86. A. S. van der Woude, "Serubbabel und die messianischen Erwartungen des Propheten Sacharja," in O. Kaiser, ed., *Lebendige Forschung im AT. ZAW* 100 Sup (1988) 147-50.
87. See Dhorme, 44-45.
88. See Layton, 175-76.
89. See in this regard Layton, 174, 178-79; in general, → XI, 602.
90. See II.2 above.
91. Additional details in Gross, 307-9; on the hyperrealistic thesis of Brownlee, see H. Simian-Yofre, → XI, 602; cf. also Layton, 172-73.
92. See Layton, 177-78.

fers to God's chastising, destructive intervention.[93] The expression *śîm* + *lipnê* occurs in isolated instances with a locative meaning (Gen. 48:20: "put ahead [as a result of evaluation]," "prefer"; Jgs. 18:21: "put in front"). It also occurs in two formulaic versions, namely, with the obj. "food" ("place before": 1 S. 28:22; 2 K. 6:22; with a deleted obj. in Gen. 24:33; 1 S. 9:24; also with *ntn,* cf. Gen. 18:8) and with the obj. "law" ("present": *d^e^bārîm:* Ex. 19:7; *mišpāṭîm:* 21:1; *tôrâ:* Dt. 4:44; the last two examples are formulated as relative clauses and thus can be classified as a variant of the formula known as the "promulgation formula" [vbs.: *ṣwh* piel, *lmd* piel, *dbr* piel, *ntn lipnê*]).[94]

'ayin. With a human subject, the expression *śîm* + *'ayin* + enclitic pronoun + *'al* + person refers to personal attention or favor (Gen. 44:21; Jer. 39:12; 40:4).[95] With a divine subject, the expression is ambivalent (though some scholars maintain that in such cases the expression has a "favorable connotation"[96]) and needs contextual qualification (*l^e^ṭôḇâ:* Jer. 24:6; *l^e^rā'â:* Am. 9:4).[97] It exhibits a literal locative meaning in 2 K. 4:34, where Elisha places his eyes upon *('al)* those of the dead child.

peh. The expression *śîm yāḏ* (variant: *kap:* Job 29:9) (enclitic pronoun) + *'al* (variant: *l^e^:* Job 29:9; 40:4; cf. the textually difficult nominal clause in Prov. 30:32[98]) + *peh* + (enclitic pronoun) refers to a gesture expressing a commitment to maintain silence. The motivation for such silence emerges contextually and includes prudence (Jgs. 18:19), startled shame (Job 21:4; Mic. 7:16), and reverence (Job 29:9; 40:4).[99] In the case of the expression *śîm* + *dāḇār* (absent from Nu. 23:12) + *b^e^pî* (enclitic pronoun/noun), several different versions can be distinguished.[100] In ordinary usage and with a human subject, the reference is to the mediation of a message both in a direct (Ezra 8:17) and a consciously anonymous (2 S. 14:3,19) messenger function.[101] With a divine subject, the expression is formulaic and describes God's actions with regard to the prophets ("inspiration formula"; Nu. 22:38; 23:5,12,16; Isa. 49:2; 59:21; variant with *ntn:* Dt. 18:18; Jer 1:9). A derivation of this formula involves theological use with a human subject in Ex. 4:15, where Aaron is designated as a prophet of Moses. Dt. 31:19 varies the expression (the obj. is now *šîrâ*) and weakens the metaphor: "put it in their mouths," where it will, as it were, remain ready to sing (cf. *mippî* in v. 21).

'ōzen. Something similar applies to the unique expression *śîm b^e'^oznê X* in Ex. 17:14 (as in Dt. 31:19, God's commission to recite the message parallels the commission to write it down).

---

93. Gross, 307; → XI, 602.

94. N. Lohfink, *Das Hauptgebot. Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5–11. AnBibl* 20 (1963), 59-63; G. Braulik, "Die Ausdrücke für 'Gesetz' im Buch Deuteronomium," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 41-42; S. J. de Vries, "The Development of the Deuteronomic Promulgation Formula," *Bibl* 55 (1974) 312; → XII, 286-87.

95. → XI, 35-36.

96. Layton, 174-75.

97. → XI, 40-41.

98. → V, 414.

99. Cf. Couroyer, 198-99; → VI, 413-14; → XI, 494-95.

100. Gross, 270-71.

101. On parallel use with *ṣwh* piel, → XI, 495.

yāḏ. The expression *śîm* + *yāḏ X* + *taḥaṯ yereḵ Y* (Gen. 24:2,9; 47:29; generally ascribed to J[102]) circumscribes the oath by the organ of procreation. In every instance the oath is administered "before dying." "The one who is facing death secures his last will by an 'oath at the source of life.'"[103] A transfer of power also takes place in 2 K. 13:16, when Elisha places his hands on *('al)* those of King Jehoash.[104] The meaning of the expression *śîm yāḏayim l*ᵉ is disputed (2 K. 11:16 par. 2 Ch. 23:15). C. Levin suggests (in a circular literary-critical argument) that the reference is to "laying hands on" (so also LXX); the philological argumentation of his source, Stade (who cites incorrect passages), is less convincing than that of P. Joüon and W. Rudolph, who understand the meaning as "make place for someone" (as already in the Tgs. and Pesh.).[105] In various forms *śîm yāḏ b*ᵉ designates a claim (theologically in Ezk. 39:21) or transfer of possession (Ps. 89:26[25]). The expression *śîm b*ᵉ*yaḏ* has no fixed form ("take in hand": Jgs. 4:21; 1 K. 20:6; "put into the hand" [theological context]: Isa. 51:23; "entrust": 2 Ch. 23:18; "put the power of wonders into one's hand" [theological context]: Ex. 4:21). Concerning expressions with *peh* and *rō'š,* see above.

kap. Whereas expressions with *b*ᵉ*yāḏ* express a firm grasp, the expression *śîm* + *nepeš* + enclitic pronoun + *b*ᵉ*ḵap* + enclitic pronoun refers to uncertain exposure ("risking one's life": Jgs. 12:3; 1 S. 19:5[4]; 28:21; Job 13:14; cf. the nominal clause in Ps. 119:109).[106]

ṣawwā'r. The expression *śîm* + *'al-ṣawwā'r* is used in a literal locative and simultaneously metaphorical sense (citing the neck as an expression of pride and dignity) in both positive (with the obj. "gold chain" as a sign of honor in Gen. 41:42) and negative sense (with the obj. "feet" as a sign of the humiliation of the defeated in Josh. 10:24).[107]

dām. Because the expression using *śîm* and *dām* is not attested in a recurring form, no formulaic use can be discerned (though such is not the case with *ntn*[108]). Nonetheless, most of the passages are based on the notion that blood shed through violence spreads out as a burden over both people and places (Dt. 22:8; 1 K. 2:5;[109] Ezk. 24:7; theological context: Jgs. 9:24[110]).

---

102. → IV, 443.

103. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. trans. 1985), 384; cf. O. Böcher, "Der Judeneid," *EvT* 30 (1970) 677; → V, 411.

104. On the iconographic background see O. Keel, *Wirkmächtige Siegeszeichen im AT. Ikonographische Studien zu Jos 8,18-26, Ex 17,8-13, 2 Kön 13,14-19 und 1 Kön 22,11. OBO* 5 (1974), 113-21.

105. C. Levin, *Der Sturz der Königin Atalja. SBS* 105 (1982), 21-22; P. Joüon, "Divers emplois métaphoriques du mot 'yad' en hébreu," *Bibl* 14 (1933) 453-54; W. Rudolph, "Die Einheitlichkeit der Erzählung vom Sturz der Atalja (2 Kön 11)," *FS A. Bertholet* (Tübingen, 1950), 475.

106. Cf. Dhorme, 150; → IX, 512.

107. Cf. Dhorme, 91; → צואר *ṣawwār,* XII, 268.

108. See G. Vanoni, *Das Buch Jona. ATS* 7 (1978), 131-32.

109. M. Noth, *Könige (1–16). BK* IX/1 (^{2}1983), 30: "cause blood to be shed."

110. See K. Koch, "Der Spruch 'Sein Blut bleibe auf seinem Haupt,'" *VT* 12 (1962) 406-9, 412.

šēm. All the expressions to be discussed here are also attested with other verbs. The two versions of the frequent expression *qr'* + *šēm* in reference to naming[111] are rendered with no discernible semantic difference by variants with *śîm,* including a verb + *śîm* + recipient + PN (Jgs. 8:31; theological context in 2 K. 17:34; Neh. 9:7; Biblical Aramaic in Dnl. 5:12; cf. with *qr'* in Gen. 2:19); verb + *l*ᵉ + recipient + *šēmôṯ* (Dnl. 1:7; with *qr'* in Gen. 2:20). In the expression *śîm* + *šēm* + *l*ᵉ + (reflexive) enclitic pronoun, the verb is interchangeable with *'śh* (cf. Gen. 11:4): "make a name (for oneself)" (2 S. 14:7; theological context in 2 S. 7:23; 1 Ch. 17:21 [read *lô* with LXX et al.]; the original expression in Zeph. 3:19).[112] The expression *śîm* (interchangeable with *škn*) + reflexive enclitic pronoun (+ *šām*) with a divine subject occurs in the Dtr History and the Chronicler's History, generally as part of what is known as the "formula of centralization" (Dt. 12:5, 21; 14:24; 1 K. 9:3; 11:36; 14:21; 2 K. 21:4,7; 2 Ch. 6:20; 12:13; 33:7; with *škn,* cf., e.g., Dt. 12:5,11). Given the materials presented by McBride, it is highly likely that the expression with *škn* represents a neologistic loan from Akk. *šakānu šumu,* "to establish fame, to acquire a reputation,"[113] whereas the expression with *śîm* represents its semantically equivalent translation. The Akkadian expression refers to inscribing a (royal) name on stelae, memorials, and buildings (e.g., after construction or renovation).[114] No one designation has yet attached itself to the Dtr expression, just as the discussion regarding the meaning of the Dtn/Dtr theology of the name and the genesis of the formula of centralization have not yet been concluded, though some scholars convincingly argue that the *šēm* expression originally belonged to the formula of centralization.[115]

Additional idiomatic expressions with *śîm* can be discussed briefly, especially since most of them are discussed in greater detail elsewhere.

ḥōq. References to the establishment of boundaries and statutes occur primarily in two forms: *śîm* + *ḥōq* (Jer. 33:25: *ḥuqqôṯ*) (+ *l*ᵉ) + applicable group or sphere (Josh. 24:25; theological context in Ex. 15:25; Prov. 8:29; Jer. 5:22; 33:25) and *śîm* + pertinent information + *l*ᵉ*ḥōq* (Gen. 47:26; 1 S. 30:25), the verb being interchangeable with *ntn* and *'śh.*[116]

*ṭ*ᵉ*'ēm.* Biblical Aram. *śîm* + *ṭ*ᵉ*'ēm* exhibits two meanings: "pay heed to" (with *'al:* Dnl. 3:12; 6:14[13]) and "make/pass a decree" (often with *min:* Ezra 4:19,21; 5:3,9,13,17; 6:1,3,8,11,12; 7:13,21; Dnl. 3:10,29; 4:3[6]; 6:27[26]). On the one hand,

---

111. → XIII, 126-27 = section VII, s.v. קרא.

112. Cf. also *HAL,* III, 1323b; Dahood, *Bibl* 53 (1972) 399-400.

113. McBride, 86-98; *CAD,* XVII/1, 144; cf. also EA 287–88.

115. On Phoen. *šyt* see Y. Avishur, "Studies of Stylistic Features Common to the Phoenician Inscriptions and the Bible," *UF* 8 (1976) 10-11.

115. N. Lohfink, "Zur deuteronomischen Zentralisationsformel," *Bibl* 65 (1984) 297-329 (with bibliog.); more recent bibliog. in D. F. Murray, "*MQWM* and the Future of Israel," *VT* 40 (1990) 308.

116. → X, 93; on the combinations and meanings → V, 142-43; G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971), 169, 171, 181; N. Lohfink, "'I Am Yahweh, Your Physician' (Exod. 15:26)," *Theology of the Pentateuch* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1994), 43-44.

Scheftelowitz traces this phenomenon back to personal influence; on the other, he finds connections in other languages between "taste, understanding, command."[117]

'ôṯ. This expression appears to be fairly consistent in passages speaking about Yahweh's miraculous signs among *(b^e)* the Egyptians (Ex. 10:2; Ps. 78:43; 105:27; Jer. 32:20; *ntn*, cf. Dt. 6:22).[118] Otherwise no fixed expressions are discernible (Gen. 4:15; Ps. 74:4; Ezk. 14:8).

gôy. The uniform formulation *śîm* + person (Ishmael, Jacob) + *l^egôy (gāḏôl)* with a divine subject in the promises of Gen. 21:13,18; and 46:3 suggests the presence of some specific literary context (though cf. *ntn* in Gen. 17:20).[119]

'ēš q^eṭōreṯ. In connection with the sacrificial cult, *śîm* functions alongside *ntn* to indicate the placing of incense (Lev. 10:1; Nu. 16:7,18; 17:11[16:46]; Ezk. 23:41; *ntn*, cf. Nu. 16:17) and fire (1 K. 18:23,25; *ntn*, cf. Lev. 1:7).

'ōrēḇ, 'ereḇ. The preferred predicate for the military obj. "ambush" is *śîm* (Josh. 8:2,12; Jgs. 20:29; Jer. 9:7[10]; *qwm* hiphil, cf. Josh. 8:7).

qēn. Finally, *śîm* is also the preferred verb for building a nest (Nu. 24:21; Ob. 4: Hab. 2:9).[120]

d. *Individual Cases*. The meaning of several unique expressions merits discussion.

Dt. 22:14,17. The expression *śîm* (+ *l^e*) + *'^alîlōṯ d^eḇārîm* is probably connected with "gossip, slander," and perhaps parallels Assyr. *šakānu abāta*.[121]

1 K. 18:42. Elijah "puts his face *(pānāyw)* between *(bên)* his knees." This contextually rather indefinite expression has prompted a number of detailed analyses and religio-historical comparisons agreeing in their rejection of an understanding as a magical gesture (Jirku: sorrow; Mach and Marks: ecstatic concentration; Bottini: prayer; Layton: in any case a literal rather than figurative meaning[122]).

Other difficult hapax legomena have already been discussed (Ex. 8:19[23]; Job 36:13; Isa. 53:10).[123]

One might also mention cases in which one-time formulations allow various conclusions regarding tradition history. The expression *śîm* + *b^erîṯ 'ôlām* (2 S. 23:5) suggests an independent redaction of the Davidic promises. The expression *śîm* + *tôrâ* + *b^e* (Ps. 78:5) together with other observations militates against classifying this psalm as part of the Dtn/Dtr tradition.[124] The concluding verse of Aaron's benediction (Nu. 6:26), with its otherwise unattested *śîm* + *šālôm* + *l^e*, evokes personal and legal con-

---

117. Scheftelowitz, 64-65.

118. → X, 93.

119. On the "great people" see A. R. Hulst, "גּוֹי/עַם *'am/gôy* people," *TLOT*, II, 909-10.

120. On the formal relationship between the passages, → XIII, 46.

121. See C. Steuernagel, *Das Deuteronomium. HKAT* I/3 (²1923), 133: "[bad] deeds [that are only] words"; → XI, 142; G. R. Driver and J. C. Miles, *The Assyrian Laws* (Oxford, 1935), A §19; cf. C. Locher, *Die Ehre einer Frau in Israel. Exegetische und rechtsvergleichende Studien zu Deuteronomium 22,13-21. OBO* 70 (1986), 366-67, with bibliog.

122. Layton, 170.

123. See I.5 above.

124. See N. Füglister, "Psalm 78: Der Rätsel Lösung?" *Congress Volume, Leuven 1989. SVT* 43 (1991), 287.

texts.[125] The latter are emphasized by the interpretation put into Yahweh's mouth in v. 27 with the unusual combination *śîm* + *šēm yhwh* + *'al,* possibly intended to establish a connection with Lev. 9:22.[126]

e. *Ellipsis.* I have already discussed breviloquence and elliptical usage above.[127] With sufficient comparative material or the appropriate contextual qualifiers, understanding the meaning of elliptical usage presents no problems. The use of *śîm* without a direct object in Jgs. 19:30; Job 23:6 (a different view is taken by Eitan; see below); 34:23; Isa. 41:20) with the contextual qualification "intellectual activity" can probably be understood as breviloquence for *śîm* + *lēḇāḇ.*[128] Although technical expressions are especially susceptible to abbreviation, they are generally easy to resolve (from the priestly tradition, cf. Lev. 10:1 with Nu. 17:11). Cases such as Job 17:3 are more difficult, and one cannot really get beyond suggestions (e.g., perhaps "make a commitment [= surety, pledge]";[129] perhaps an ellipsis of *yaḏ* + *taḥaṯ yārēḵ;* cf. Gen. 24:2; perhaps textual emendation required).[130] Disputed cases include the military expressions in 1 S. 15:2 (*ḥereḇ, pānîm* [with LXX]? and 1 K. 20:12 [*māṣôr*]).[131] C. F. Burney finds in 1 S. 15:2; 1 K. 20:12; and Ezk. 23:24 a general expression for "military mobilization" and rejects the presence of breviloquence.[132] Eitan similarly rejects an elliptical understanding and postulates a special meaning for *śîm* (in Ezk. 23:24; Job 23:6 as well) according to Arab. *šāma* in the sense of "a well-organized attack of war," though his own etymological argumentation cannot dispense entirely with ellipsis ("putting the weapon into the breast of the enemy").[133]

f. *Substantives.* Finally, cases deserving special consideration include those in which *śîm* takes as its object an abstract substantive corresponding to a root-related verb. Examples include *śîm śeḵel* (Neh. 8:8) alongside *śkl* hiphil (Neh. 9:20; Prov. 16:23; 21:11), *śîm kāḇôḏ* (Josh. 7:19; Isa. 42:12; cf. Ps. 66:2) alongside *kbd* piel (Ps. 22:24[23]; Isa. 24:15, etc.), *śîm raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* (Isa. 47:6) alongside *rḥm* piel (Isa. 14:1; Jer. 31:20, etc.). Given the scarcity of possibilities for testing interchangeability, the semantic difference between the substantival (periphrastic) combination and a purely verbal rendering is not

---

125. See also G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1957), 87, concerning an Aramaic witness (13:5).

126. Cf. K. Seybold, *Der aaronitische Segen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977), 40-44, 71, who does, however, overestimate the value of the LXX rendering (see I.2 above); he does not consider comparisons with *ntn* + *šālôm* (→ X, 93) and as a result construes an essential difference between *śîm* and *ntn;* cf. also *HAL,* III, 1325a.

127. See I.5; II.3.a above.

128. See *GesB,* 784.

129. See Fürst, II, 423.

130. See the discussion in F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (⁴1983), 258.

131. For the former see the discussion in P. D. Stern, "I Samuel 15: Towards an Ancient View of the War-Ḥerem," *UF* 21 (1989) 415. For the latter see P. Joüon, "Notes de lexicographie hébraïque," *Mélanges de la Faculté de Beyrouth* 4 (1910) 16, with reference to Mic. 4:14 and an Aramaic inscription.

132. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (Oxford, 1903), 234.

133. Eitan, 60-62. See I.3 above.

easy to discern.[134] Whereas *śîm śeḵel* in Neh. 8:8 leaves open whether the Levites "engage understanding" or "provide aids to understanding,"[135] one can probably assume that the other passages emphasize theologically prominent abstract nouns, including *kāḇôḏ;*[136] *raḥᵃmîm*[137] (*ntn* + *raḥᵃmîm* is always associated with a divine subject; the variant with *śîm* in Isa. 47:6 with a human subject might refer to the delegation of divine faculties and was possibly coined under Akkadian influence[138]).

4. *Theological Themes.* The analysis of idioms revealed that *śîm* represents a popular theological expression occurring with particular concentration in certain traditions.[139] The examination of meaning already suggested semantic focal points in the term's theological use as well as certain reasons for the biblical writers' preference for verbs such as *śîm.*[140] Because secular and theological use of *śîm* cannot always be distinguished, the examination of idioms repeatedly drew attention to theological passages.[141] Because *TDOT* already deals with the majority of theologically relevant objects of *śîm* in connection with their respective entries, here I sketch only those theological themes and contexts not already mentioned elsewhere, thereby simultaneously illustrating the multiplicity of the divine actions of "effecting" and "setting, putting." Because the expressions or combinations vary, these themes generally involve less formulaic language than fixed notions, particularly in connection with God's actions with regard to creation.

Those persons are considered happy who make God (Ps. 40:5[4], with *miḇṭāḥ*) rather than gold (Job 31:24, with *kesel*) their trust. The psalmist instructs children to set their hope in God (Ps. 78:7, with *kesel*).

Historical accounts, wisdom instruction, and devoted confession all agree that God put human beings in the world (in the garden of Eden: Gen. 2:8; on earth: Job 20:4; in life: Ps. 66:9). God intervenes in human life to offer protection (the sign of Cain: Gen. 4:15), refuge (during a theophany: Ex. 33:22), gifts or handicaps for a person ("Who gives speech to mortals? Who makes them mute or deaf, seeing or blind?": Ex. 4:11). He creates living space for people (*māqôm:* Ex. 21:13; 2 S. 7:10 = 1 Ch. 17:9; similarly with regard to the ark: 1 K. 8:21[142]) and multiplies a person's offspring (Gen. 13:16; 32:13[12]; 1 S. 2:20; cf. Dt. 10:22; Ps. 89:30[29]; 107:41). He "sets on high" those who are low (Job 5:11) and makes the oppressed the "head of the nations" (Ps.

---

134. See the preliminary theoretical considerations in Labuschagne, 782-83; Vanoni, *Literarkritik,* 158, 171-72.

135. C. Siegfried and B. Stade, *Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1893), 748.

136. Cf. C. Westermann, "כבד *kbd* to be heavy," *TLOT,* II, 590-602; → VII, 26-27; a different view is taken by E. Lipiński, → X, 104, who understands *kāḇôḏ* as a concrete reference to "total possessions."

137. See H. J. Stoebe, "רחם *rḥm* pi., to have mercy," *TLOT,* III, 1225-26.

138. → XIII, 445, with bibliog.

139. See II.1 above.

140. See II.3.b above.

141. See II.3.c above.

142. See D. F. Murray, *VT* 40 (1990) 309-19.

18:44[43]). God entrusts some individuals to perform tasks on behalf of the people, making Joseph a "lord" (Gen. 45:8,9; Ps. 105:21) and Solomon a "king" (1 K. 10:9). He makes the Servant of Yahweh into a "polished arrow" and his mouth into a "sharp sword" (Isa. 49:2-3; cf. Zech. 9:13). He often engages Israel as an instrument of history (a sharp threshing sledge, Isa. 41:15; similarly in Mic. 4:13; a proud warhorse, Zech. 10:3; a cup of reeling, 12:2; a heavy stone, 12:3; a blazing pot, 12:6).

People acknowledge God as the Lord of life whenever they understand the restriction or diminution of life as the result of God's actions. God sets a guard against them as if against "the Sea, or the Dragon" (Job 7:12), pays no attention to their pleading (24:12), makes what they say into nothing (*lᵉʾal:* 24:25). He sets darkness in their path (19:8), puts plagues (Ex. 8:8[12]), burdens (Ps. 66:11), and sickness upon them (Ex. 15:26; Dt. 7:15). The burden God puts on Moses by making him responsible for the people (Nu. 11:11) he then ameliorates by putting onto the seventy elders some of the spirit that is on Moses (v. 17; cf. in this regard Isa. 63:11[12]).

God's activity in "putting" or "placing" is not limited to human life — he placed the entire world (*tēḇēl,* Job 34:13). He takes care of the celestial bodies and the animals, setting a tent for the sun (Ps. 19:5[4]) and making the steppe into the home of the wild ass (Job 39:6). He becomes lord over the earth by "bringing desolations" ("terrible/devastating 'placings,'" *šammôṯ:* Ps. 46:9[8]; v. 10[9] speaks of making wars cease), and lord over the crocodile by "putting a rope in its nose" (Job 40:26[41:2]). God rules creation in both time and space by giving commands (Job 37:15), setting a time (Ex. 9:5; Job 34:23), boundaries (Ps. 104:9), measurements (Job 38:5), bars and doors (Job 38:10) (see also the discussion above regarding *ḥōq*).

God's helping, admonishing, destructive, and revivifying actions in such "putting" and "making" accompany Israel through their history. During the exodus, he makes the sea dry (Ex. 14:21) and puts darkness *(maʾᵃpēl)* between Israel and their pursuers (Josh. 24:7). He puts a hook into the nose of Israel's enemies (2 K. 19:28 = Isa. 37:29) and makes their city into a "possession of the hedgehog" (Isa. 14:23). He makes the nations judges *(lᵉmišpāṭ)* over Israel (Hab. 1:12). He exposes Jerusalem by setting it in the center of the nations (Ezk. 5:5) and secures the throne of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. 43:10; cf. the reference to Yahweh's own throne in the oracle of judgment, 49:38). He makes Israel's or the enemy's land a "desolation" (*šammâ, šᵉmāmâ:* Isa. 13:9; Jer. 6:8; 18:16; 25:12; 51:29; Mic. 1:7; Zech. 7:14; their cities in Jer. 19:8; Zeph. 2:13; mountains in Mal. 1:3; people in Jer. 25:9; Hos. 2:5[3]; cf. Lam. 3:11) or into a "forest" (*yaʿar:* Hos. 2:14[12]) or "ruin" (*ʿawwâ:* Ezk. 21:32; *ḥorbâ:* Ezk. 35:4; *ʿî:* Mic. 1:6; cf. *mᵉḥittâ* in Ps. 89:41[40]). He makes rivers into a "desert" (*miḏbār:* Ps. 107:33; Isa. 50:2) and makes a "grave" for Nineveh (Nah. 1:14). Those suffering from war, banishment, and distress find that God has made them into a "spectacle" (*rᵒʾî:* Nah. 3:6), a "plaything" (*māḏôn:* Ps. 80:7[6] [NRSV "scorn/strife"]; cf. Job 7:20, "target"), a "song of mockery" (*māšāl:* Ps. 44:15[14]; Ezk. 14:8[?]), "filth" (*sᵉḥî:* Lam. 3:45; Biblical Aram. *nᵉwālû:* Dnl. 2:5), subjecting them to scorn (*ḥerpâ:* Ps. 39:9[8]; 44:14[13]). Finally, the combination of *śîm* + *kᵉ* + PN functions similarly as a threat of judgment (Jer. 29:22; Hos. 11:8; cf. Gen. 48:20 in relation to blessing).

In connection with the gathering (cf. Mic. 2:12 with *śîm* + *yaḥaḏ*) and the reestablishment of Israel, authors in part reverse these references to the destructive divine actions

of "putting" and "making." God now makes the wilderness into a pool of water (*'ªgam:* Ps. 107:35; Isa. 41:18) and into the garden of Eden (Isa. 51:3), makes rivers into firm islands (Isa. 42:15) and darkness into light (Isa. 42:16; cf. the reversal in Jer. 13:16). He will "put in the wilderness the cedar, the acacia, the myrtle, and the olive" (Isa. 41:19). With his miraculous powers God "makes a way" through the otherwise untraversable wilderness (Isa. 43:19; 49:11; 51:10).[143] He transforms "the lame" into a (holy) remnant" and "those who were cast off" into a strong nation (Mic. 4:7), and magically transforms Jerusalem's pinnacle and gates into precious stones (Isa. 54:12).[144] He makes Zerubbabel like a signet ring (Hag. 2:23) and makes the formerly forsaken city "majestic forever, a joy from age to age" (Isa. 60:15). He makes "peace" *(šālôm)* Jerusalem's "overseer" (Isa. 60:17) and its "borders" (Ps. 147:14; cf. also Nu. 6:26).

Most of these passages attest a high degree of poetic creativity. This innovative imagery can get lost if a translation switches the objects[145] or if the original metaphors in the text are rendered by lexically generated idioms. The theological function of these daring metaphors in disrupting fixed notions is also lost. Some of these metaphors are worth mentioning here in conclusion. It is God who bestows his splendor upon the chosen city (Ezk. 16:14), who clothes the heavens with blackness (Isa. 50:3), and shrouds the sea in clouds and thick darkness (Job 38:9). It is God who makes justice the line and righteousness the plummet (Isa. 28:17), who makes the clouds his chariot (Ps. 104:3), who puts the tears of the petitioner in a bottle (Ps. 56:9[8]) and makes his feet like the "feet of a deer" (Hab. 3:19).[146]

III. 1. *Sirach.* Sirach uses *śîm* 12 times in the qal (5:12; 6:32; 14:21,26; 16:20,24; 33[36]:2; 34[31]:16; 36[33]:9,11; 45:5,7), once in the hiphil (11:30), and once as the subst. *śîmâ,* "treasure" (41:4).[147] LXX renderings include *-tith-* (3 times) and *-didon-* (twice). Parallel expressions include only verbs meaning "intellectual activity," alongside OT *byn* (14:21; 16:20), *šmʻ* (16:24), and *ʻrm* (6:32). Idiomatic expressions include *śîm yāḏ* + *ʻal peh* (gesture of silence, 5:12), *śîm lēḇ* + *ʻal* ("pay attention to," 14:21; 16:24; theological context in 16:20 [negation]; without *ʻal* in 6:32) and *śîm* + *lip̱nê* ("put food before someone," 34[31]:16). The extra occurrence in the Hebrew text in 11:30 generates the peculiar expression *śîm* hiphil + *rîḇ* + *l*ᵉ ("they put quarreling for all the good that was done for them").[148] Nine of fourteen occurrences are in theological contexts and are for the most part original formulations. Sir. 14:26 (cf. also v. 21) positively alters the combination *śîm* + *qēn,* which in the OT usually expresses false self-confidence, and summons

143. See T. Seidl, "Jahwe der Krieger-Jahwe der Tröster," *BN* 21 (1983) 127-28.

144. On this interpretation see Vanoni, *Literarkritik,* 198; a different view is taken by G. Glassner, *Vision eines auf Verheissung gegründeten Jerusalem. Textanalytische Studien zu Jesaja 54. Österreichische Biblische Studien* 11 (Klosterneuburg, 1991), 75-76, albeit with unpersuasive semantic argumentation.

145. See Vanoni, *Literarkritik,* 198-99.

146. Concerning the metonymic abbreviation see Jenni, 147.

147. See *ANH,* 410.

148. G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach. JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 534.

the reader to lodge in the boughs of (divine) wisdom.[149] God's actions in this sense involve his salvific intervention (33[36]:2: he "puts all the nations in fear," *paḥaḏ*), his actions in history (45:5: he puts the commandments [*miṣwâ*] and the law of life and knowledge [*tôraṯ ḥayyîm, t^e^ḇûnâ*] into Moses' hands [cf. Ex. 24:12]; 45:7: he makes an everlasting covenant with Aaron [cf. Ex. 28:43]), and his positing of order and distinctions (36[33]:9: he makes some days into "numbered days" [*y^e^mê mispār*], i.e., into weekdays as opposed to the sacred Sabbath]; 36[33]:11: he divides people, all of whom are made from dust, into "generations on earth" [*dōrê ha'^a^ḏāmâ*]; concerning this motif of differentiated order, which is characteristic of Sirach, cf. also 39:16,21,30-34).

2. *Qumran.* The Hebrew root has thus far appeared about 65 times (15 uncertain) in the Qumran documents, including 35 times (i.e., 75% of reliable occurrences) in theological contexts.[150] Alongside the verb, the subst. *śymh,* "treasure," is also attested (Q504 7,9).

The Temple Scroll picks up biblical expressions in several instances, including a variant (Aramaic influence?) of the defamation expression in Dt. 22:14 (*'lwt dbrym,* 11QT 65:7,11), the royal-installation expression in Dt. 17:14-15 (*śym mlk 'l,* 11QT 56:13,14), and the Dtn/Dtr naming formula (*śym šm,* 11QT 3:4; 52:16,20[151]). Additional occurrences relate to Dt. 14:1 (11QT 48:8) and 22:8 (11QT 65:6). In the Rule documents, God's actions in this respect involve the determination of the elect (1QM 12:2) or of their names (CD 2:13) and the installation of the two spirits "of truth and injustice" (1QS 3:18; 4:16,25).[152] CD 20:9 considers all to be lost who put idols on their hearts (*śmw glwlym 'l lbm;*[153] is *'l* supposed to evoke the expression in Dt. 11:18?).

The hymnic literature also picks up OT expressions. The David of Ps. 151 carries out the biblical injunction[154] to accord all glory to Yahweh (*w'śymh lyhwh kbwd,* 11QPs^a^ 28:5) and considers himself installed by God as the "ruler" and "prince" of his people (11QPs^a^ 28:11; cf. l. 3). God's sovereignty is made manifest when he makes a person a mockery and scorn (*ḥrph,* 1QH 2:9; cf. 2:33-34) and into a banner *(ns)* to the elect (1QH 2:13). 1QH 2:20 *(ky śmth npšy bṣrwr hḥyym)* cites 1 S. 25:29 (there with *hyh*). 1QSb 5:26 *(yśm qrnykh brzl)* and 4Q381 46:7 (*wprswtm tśym nḥ'šh* with a change from 1st to 3rd person) cite Mic. 4:13, and 4Q372 1:7 formulates the prophecy of Mic. 3:12 with *śym* in a narrative context. 4Q501 1:9 *(wlw' śmwkh lngdmh)* picks up Ps. 54:5(3). The expression *śîm + bil^e^ḇaḇ,* which is only used reflexively in the OT (1 S. 21:13[12]), is used transitively in 4Q511 63, III, 1-2), asserting that God has placed into the heart *(blby)* the "secret of the commencement of all human actions"[155] and has

---

149. → XIII, 46; on the goddess of the boughs as the iconographic background, see S. Schroer, "Die Zweiggöttin bis Sirach," *Jerusalem: Texte, Bilder, Steine. Zum 100. Geburtstag von Hildi + Othmar Keel-Leu. NTOA* 6 (1987), 218-21.

150. On the sparse Aramaic occurrences see Coxon, 500.

151. See in this regard Langer, 50-74.

152. → XIII, 397-98.

153. → VII, 436.

154. See II.3.f above.

155. → X, 177.

also put into the heart the capacity for "opening a fountain of knowledge to all men of insight" (*śmth blbbw lptwḥ,* 1QH 2:18). The OT expression *śîm* + *b*ᵉ + *peh* acquires a new object when God puts into the mouth of the petitioner something resembling rain (*kywrh gšm,* for those who thirst? 1QH 8:16; cf. 11:33 [with lacuna]). To these examples one can add a series of new combinations and original metaphors. God makes those who pray the Words of the Luminaries into his children "in the sight of all the nations" (*wbnym śmtnw lkh l'yny kwl hgwym,* 4Q504 1-2, III, 5). He makes the petitioner into the father of the children of grace (*wtśymny 'b lbny ḥsd,* 1QH 7:20), and causes him to dwell in a foreign abode "with the many fishers" (*wtśymny bmgwr 'mdygym rbym,* 5:7-8). He makes him "like a strong tower" (*wtśymny kmgdl 'wz,* 7:8). He does not place his decree in the "congregation of vanity" (*wbswd n'lmym l' śmth ḥwqy,* 7:34), nor does he give him merely a "fleshly refuge" (*wyṣr bśr l' śmth m'wz,* 10:23; cf. also 1:28; 6:26; 4Q511 28-29, 3). As in the benediction of Aaron, *śîm* occupies a firm position in the Qumran benedictions. "May he make you holy among his people" (*wyśymkh qdw[š] b'mw,* 1QSb 4:27); "may he set you as a splendid jewel in the midst of the congregation of the saints" (*wyśymkh mklwl hdr,* 1QSb 3:25).

Vanoni

שָׂכַל *śāḵal;* שֵׂכֶל *śēḵel;* מַשְׂכִּיל *maśkîl*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences: 1. Aramaic/Syriac; 2. Hebrew; 3. LXX. III. Meaning, Word Field. IV. Use: 1. Hiphil: a. Have Insight; b. Understand Something; c. Make Someone Insightful/Make Someone Understand Something; d. Be Successful; e. The Subject; 2. *śeḵel/śēḵel;* 3. *maśkîl;* 4. Aram. Hithpael and *śoḵlᵉṯānû.* V. Qumran.

śāḵal. G. W. Ahlström, *Psalm 89* (Lund, 1959), esp. 21-26; L. Delekat, "Probleme der Psalmenüberschriften," *ZAW* 76 (1964) 280-97, esp. 282-83; S. Freyne, "The Disciples in Mark and the *maśkilim* in Daniel: A Comparison," *Journal for the Study of the NT* 16 (1982) 7-23; M. Gertner, "Terms of Scriptural Interpretation," *BSOAS* 25 (1962) 1-27, esp. 22-24; J. Hempel, "Die Stellung des Laien in Qumrān," in H. Bardtke, ed., *Qumrān-Probleme* (Berlin, 1963), 193-215; K. Koenen, "*Maśkîl*-'Wechselgesang.' Eine neue Deutung zu einem Begriff der Psalmenüberschriften," *ZAW* 103 (1991) 109-12; H. Kosmala, "Maśkîl," *FS T. H. Gaster. JANES* 5 (1973) 235-41; H. von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen im NT. WMANT* 64 (1990) 120-83; V. Maag, "Zur Übersetzung von *maśkil* in Amos 5,13, Ps. 47,8 und in den Überschriften einiger Psalmen," *Schweizerische theologische Umschau* 13 (Bern, 1943) 108-15; W. McKane, *Prophets and Wise Men. SBT* 1/44 (1965), esp. 67-68, 90-93; C. A. Newsom, "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the *maśkîl,*" in J. G. Gammie and L. G. Perdue, eds., *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1990), 373-82; H. S. Nyberg, "Smärtornas man," *SEÅ* 7 (1942) 5-82, esp. 41-45; M. Sæbø, "שׂכל *śkl* hi., to have insight," *TLOT,* III, 1269-72.

I. Etymology. The verb *śkl* I, "to have insight," is attested only in the hiphil and represents a denominative of the abstract noun *śēḵel/śeḵel,* "insight."[1] The subst. ptcp. *maśkîl* used as a technical term in the Psalm superscriptions is generally derived from this verb. Alongside *śkl* I, the homonymous root *śkl* II piel, "cross," is also attested in Gen. 48:14.

In Gen. 48:13ff. Jacob moves his left hand to the right onto Manasseh as a sign of blessing and his right hand to the left onto Ephraim. Tg. Onq. *('aḥkîminnûn),* Arabic *('ḥkm),* LXX[Vn] *(ephrénōse),* and Luther all take *śkl* I as their point of departure in v. 14b and interpret the statement to mean that Jacob used his hands "with understanding," i.e., laid them consciously in this fashion (cf. v. 19).[2] What remains unclear is why the author used a piel instead of the customary hiphil. Almost all more recent comms. postulate *śkl* II in v. 14, "intertwine, cross," a choice supported by Tg. Isa. *(prg),* LXX *(enalláx),* Vg. *(commutans),* and Pesh. *(šḥlp).* On this view v. 14b would then explicate the preceding statement in the sense of "by crossing his hands."[3] Concerning *śkl* II, cf. Arab. *šakala,* "plait, weave, bind together," *šikāl,* "cord"; Akk. *šakkilu,* "headband"; both Theodotion (Dnl. 8:25) and LXX (Prov. 19:14) translate *śkl* as "fetter," or "be bound." G. R. Driver also finds *śkl* II in Isa. 52:13, where he reads *yiśśāḵēl,* "he is bound," rather than *yaśkîl.*[4]

L. Blau believes there is only one root *śkl,* comparable to Arab. *'ql,* which can mean both "bind" and "understand"; on this view *śkl* means both "lay crosswise" and "understand" (cf. *syníēmi,* "bring together," "understand").[5] Gertner relates *śkl* both to analytical understanding (intellectual capacity) and to harmony and combinational synthesis (artistic capacity).[6] F. Delitzsch views *s/śkl,* "plait together," as a stem from which he then derives the contrasting meanings "have insight" and "be uncomprehending."[7] Delitzsch is probably postulating a semantic development "plait together–combine–have insight" as well as "plait together–mix together–confuse–be confused, uncomprehending."

II. Occurrences.

1. *Aramaic/Syriac.* Outside Hebrew, the root *śkl* occurs in the Semitic languages only in Aramaic and Syriac (Eblaite *ti-iš-tá-qì-lum* is not related to *śkl,* but to *šql,* "weigh"[8]). In Imperial Aramaic, *skl* ithpaal is attested in the Words of Ahiqar (5th/4th century).[9] In Jewish Aramaic, *s/śkl* aphel means "have insight" and "make insightful," then ithpaal "acquire insight, comprehend, pay attention"; the adj. *s/śuḵlᵉṯānā'* means

1. See *BLe,* §38b′. On 1 S. 18:30 see II.2.c below.
2. *KD,* in loc.; S. R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis. Westminster Comm.* ([12]1926), 377.
3. Cf. *Pesiq. Rab.* 3; Koenen, 111.
4. G. R. Driver, "Isaiah 52:13–53:12," *In Memoriam P. Kahle. BZAW* 103 (1968), 90-91.
5. "Über homonyme und angeblich homonyme Wurzeln II," *VT* 7 (1957) 101; cf. *LexSyr,* 473.
6. Gertner, 23.
7. *KD,* in loc.; cf. → סכל *skl,* X, 255-58; Ahlström, 22.
8. Contra C. H. Gordon, in idem, G. A. Rendsburg, and N. H. Winter, eds., *Eblaitica I* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1987), 28; cf. *Materiali Epigrafici di Ebla,* IV, 326, 1184.
9. Concerning Biblical Aramaic see IV.4 below.

"insightful, having insight," and the nouns *s/śûḵlā', s/śîḵlā', saḵlānûṯā', sûḵlᵉṯānû(ṯā'),* and *sîkkûlā',* mean "insight, understanding." In Syriac one finds *skl* pael, "cause to have insight, proclaim," ethpael "comprehend," *swkl'/skwltnwt',* "insight," *swkly',* "that which is characteristic," and *skwltn',* "insightful."[10]

Ahiqar 147 contains the summons *'l tstkl kbyr* with the fragmentary continuation . . . . *l yd'k ḥ*. . . . W. Baumgartner derives *tstkl* from → סכל *skl,* "be foolish," and translates "don't act foolish like an idiot."[11] Generally, however, *skl* is viewed as an orthographic variant of *śkl.* The verb might then be understood as a verb of seeing; cf. Jewish Aram. *śkl* ithpaal. P. Joüon translates: "do not consider that which is (too) great (for) you."[12] H. L. Ginsberg views *kbyr* not as an object but as an adverb, translating, "gaze not overmuch (les)t thy vi(sion) be dimmed."[13] According to W. McKane this is to be understood as a metaphorical injunction not to look too closely lest one dissipate one's energy.[14] M. Seidel understands *'l tstkl kbyr* in the light of Eccl. 7:16, *'al-tiṯḥakkam yôṯēr* ("do not act too wise"), and renders the passage in Ahiqar in the sense of "do not act too clever," an interpretation supported by the context.[15] The contrasting admonitions in Ahiqar 148, "be not too sweet . . . be not too bitter," correspond in Ahiqar 146-47 to the two antithetical injunctions "remove not wisdom from thee . . . be not too clever."[16]

2. *Hebrew.* A survey of the Hebrew occurrences of *śkl* reveals the following.

a. In Eccl. 1:17 and Isa. 44:25 (cf. the Masora), *śkl* is merely an orthographic variant of → סכל *skl.*

b. In Jer. 50:9 most comms. correctly read the well-attested (see *BHS*) *maśkîl,* "successful," instead of *maškîl.* Only *maśkîl* offers an appropriate parallel to "empty-handed, vainly." Moreover, contextually the author cannot be emphasizing the brutality of the nations advancing against Babylon by comparing their arrows to those of a warrior who "makes childless," i.e., who kills children. Jer. 50:8-9 focuses solely on the military "success" of the nations, since it is this success that will bring about Israel's liberation from exile. Only an understanding of the text focusing on revenge on Babylon first interpreted *maškîl* as a hiphil of *škl,* which is otherwise attested only in Hos. 9:14.

c. The qal of *śkl* occurs only in 1 S. 18:30, where according to the context it must

---

10. *LexSyr,* 473.

11. W. Baumgartner, "Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel," *ZAW* 45 (1927) 102 = *Zum AT und seiner Umwelt* (Leiden, 1959), 90. Cf. A. Ungnad, *Aramäische Papyrus aus Elephantine* (Leipzig, 1911), 76; J. M. Lindenberger, *The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar* (Baltimore, 1983), 147-48.

12. P. Joüon, *MUSJ* 18 (1934) 88; cf. *DNSI,* II, 785.

13. *ANET,* 429.

14. *Proverbs. OTL* (³1977), 175-76.

15. "Bemerkungen zu den aramäischen Papyrus und Ostraka aus Elephantine," *ZAW* 32 (1912) 296-97.

16. *ANET,* 429; cf. *AP,* 243; *AOT,* 461; P. Grelot, "Les proverbes araméens d'Ahiqar," *RB* 68 (1961) 189; idem, *Documents araméens d'Égypte. LAPO* 5 (1972) 443.

17. See *HAL,* III, 1328b.

mean "have success." Instead of postulating a qal usage of *śkl* corresponding to the hiphil,[17] one should rather emend the text to *hiśkîl, yaśkîl,* or *maśkîl.* Reading *maśkîl* is supported by the fact that 1 S. 18:14-15 already refers to David twice as *maśkîl* and by the fact that the missing *m* can easily be explained as a result of haplography.[18]

d. In 1 S. 25:3 *śeḵel* means "insight, understanding."

No independent noun *śeḵel* meaning "form" is attested. Adducing Arab. *šakl,* "form," F. Perles postulates a Hebrew word with precisely the same meaning in 1 S. 25:3.[19] As in Gen. 29:17; 39:6; Est. 2:7, a hendiadys allegedly describes a person's beauty. Abigail had a beautiful form and nice appearance. The narrative flow of 1 S. 25 itself militates against this view, one already criticized by J. Barr.[20] Abigail and her husband, Nabal, appear as antipodes. Whereas Nabal — whose name already characterizes him as a fool — behaves quite devoid of understanding toward David and as a result dies, his wife's behavior shows her to be a prudent wife who thus becomes the wife of the later king. The flow of the narrative thus requires that Abigail be presented at the beginning not merely as particularly beautiful but as beautiful and insightful.

Taking this evidence into consideration, we find that the root *śkl* occurs 91 times in the Hebrew OT (Ps. 14:2 = 53:3[Eng. 2] counted twice). Of these, 61 passages use *śkl* hiphil, 16 *śeḵel/śēḵel,* and 14 *maśkîl* as a technical term in the Psalm superscriptions. The hiphil of *śkl* occurs quite often as a participle (22 times, including 8 times in the sg. in Proverbs, 5 times in the pl. in Daniel) and as the infinitive (14 times). The participle describes how a reasonable or successful person acts and fares. The infinitive is generally used substantivally in the sense of "insight, prudence," corresponding thus to *śeḵel.*

The noun appears 7 times in the historical books (including 6 times in the Chronicler's History), the verb 15 times. Of these 15 occurrences, 10 are found in the Dtr History and 4 in the Chronicler's History. In the latter, *hiśkîl* always means "have insight" or "comprehend," whereas in the Dtr History (excepting Dt. 32:29) it always means "have success." 1 S. 18 uses the term 4 times in reference to David's military success. Dt. 29:8(9); Josh. 1:7,8; 1 K. 2:3; 2 K. 18:7 all use *hiśkîl* in a typically Dtr fashion. These statements focus variously on the results (*lᵉmaʿan* in Dt. 29:8[9]; Josh. 1:7; 1 K. 2:3, or *wᵉʾāz* in Josh. 1:8) of correct observance of the law. If Israel or its leaders keep the law, they will be successful in a comprehensive sense.

In the prophetic writings *hiśkîl* first appears in the 6th century, and then (excepting Am. 5:13) only 6 times in Jeremiah and 3 in Deutero-Isaiah. The authenticity of all these passages is disputed.

Am. 5:13 is probably a late addendum.[21] J. L. Mays believes that a glossator who, in

---

18. Cf. *RHB,* III, 234; *KBL²,* 922. On the syntactic construction see *GK,* §116q,r.

19. "A Misunderstood Hebrew Word," *JQR* 17 (1926/27) 233.

20. *CPT,* 244-45.

21. Cf. G. Fleischer, *Von Menschenverkäufern, Baschankühen und Rechtsverkehren. Die Sozialkritik des Amosbuches in historisch-kritischer, sozialgeschichtlicher und archäologischer Perspektive. BBB* 74 (1989), 115, 129-30, 256.

contrast to Amos, is a quietist, is remarking that in an age of repression (v. 12) the most prudent course of action is to keep silent (cf. Prov. 10:19).[22] Within the context of the book of Amos, however, it seems to make more sense if one relates the age in question not to the present age of injustice but to the future age of divine judgment (cf. Mic. 2:3). At the commencement of this judgment, prudent persons will keep silent and abandon all resistance against Amos because they will have to acknowledge the veracity of the prophetic word.[23] Am. 5:13 can be considered original if one associates *bāʿēṯ hahîʾ* with *maśkîl* contrary to the accentuation. The point is not that one keeps silent in the future, but that one has insight into the future (*bᵉ* of thing[24]). Those who, like Amos, recognize the imminent day of Yahweh will fall silent.[25] According to G. V. Smith,[26] the author is announcing to the successful, to the members of the upper classes, that they will fall silent (i.e., die). E. Sellin understands *maśkîl* as in the Psalm superscriptions as "hymn"; Amos is allegedly announcing that all hymns will fall silent on the day of Yahweh.[27]

The root *śkl* occurs most frequently in the "didactic writings." The verb appears 13 times in Proverbs (8 times as the sg. ptcp.), the noun 6 times. Both generally involve completely secular rather than theological insight. The verb occurs 11 times in the Psalms, the noun once. Here the focus is always on theological insight, including knowledge of God or of his works and commandments. The same applies to the book of Job, where the verb appears 3 times, the noun once. The verb occurs 9 times in the book of Daniel, the noun once. Reference to the *maśkîlîm* here deserves special attention (11:33,35; 12:3,10). In the tribulations of the end time, Israel will be divided into two camps, into apostates on the one hand, and those loyal to Yahweh on the other. At the center of those loyal to Yahweh one finds the more or less clearly outlined group of the *maśkîlîm*. These persons with "insight" (NRSV "the wise among the people") are endowed with special eschatological knowledge (12:10), which they pass on to the other believers (11:33). Although many of them face martyrdom (11:35),[28] they will nonetheless participate in a special fashion in glory of the *eschaton* (12:3). With O. Plöger one can probably understand the *maśkîlîm* as "an extreme eschatological group within the Hasideans."[29]

The root *śkl* occurs 21 times in the Hebrew Sirach fragments, including passages in which the root is attested in only one manuscript. The hiphil ptcp. occurs in 7:19,21;

---

22. *Amos. OTL* (1969), 98; cf. A. J. O. van der Wal, "Amos 5:13 — een omstreden tekst," *NedTT* 41 (1987) 89-98.

23. See H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 249-50.

24. See IV.1.b below.

25. So *RHB*, V, 241; K. Cramer, *Amos. Versuch einer theologischen Interpretation. BWANT* 15 (1930), 85-86; cf. by contrast Maag, 114-15.

26. "Amos 5:13: The Deadly Silence of the Prosperous," *JBL* 107 (1988) 289-91; cf. J. J. Jackson, "Amos 5:13 Contextually Understood," *ZAW* 98 (1986) 434-35.

27. *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch. KAT* XII/1 (1922), 239-40. See IV.3 below.

28. Cf. by contrast J.-C. Lebram, *Das Buch Daniel. ZBK* 23 (1984), 132.

29. *Das Buch Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1965), 165; cf. Hempel, 202-3; K. Koch, *Das Buch Daniel. EdF* 144 (1980), 165-66.

10:23,25; 13:22; 40:23; 47:12. The noun occurs in 8:9; 10:3,30; 11:15; 13:23; 15:3; 16:24; 26:13; 35:2,3,18; 40:18; 42:20; 50:27. As in Proverbs, *śkl* is used primarily in secular contexts.

This survey shows that the root occurs especially in wisdom texts. Almost all occurrences date to the exilic/postexilic period. Just which passages are possibly older (Gen. 3:6; 1 S. 18; Ps. 2:10; several proverbs) remains a matter of dispute.

3. *LXX.* The LXX translates the verb in 17 and the noun in 9 different ways; including derivatives, the LXX uses especially *syniénai* (41 times), *noeín* (17), *epístasthai* (6), *phroneín* (2), and *synetízein* (2). It always translates *maśkîl* in the Psalm superscriptions with a form of *sýnesis.* Strikingly, except for Prov. 17:8, the LXX never translates the root *śkl* in the sense of "be successful." Aquila almost always renders *śkl* with forms of the root *epíst-*.

III. Meaning, Word Field. Only a semantic field rather than a basic meaning can be determined for *śkl.* In an ingressive sense *śkl* means "become insightful/reasonable" (Ps. 2:10; 94:8);[30] in a stative sense it means "be insightful/reasonable." The focus is not primarily on any one, specific intellectual ability,[31] but rather on the more general use of common sense. It is only in the Chronicler's History and Daniel that *śkl* first begins referring to the wisdom of an intellectual elite. The root *śkl* is also used with an object in the sense of "comprehending something." In this context one can distinguish the aspects of "acquiring knowledge" (Neh. 8:13; Ps. 94:8; 119:99; Isa. 41:20), "possessing knowledge" (2 Ch. 30:22), and "transmitting knowledge."[32]

Being reasonable includes corresponding behavior. A reasonable person practices justice and righteousness (Ps. 36:4[3]; 101:2; Jer. 23:5), and from such behavior success follows according to the OT understanding of the act-consequence nexus. Hence *śkl* can also refer to success in the sense of a fulfilled life, though also more concretely in the sense of individual successes, e.g., a military victory.

In connection with *śkl,* God appears as the one who grants a person insight, i.e., the capacity for insight and understanding (1 Ch. 22:12; cf. Job 17:4), or transmits insight to a person.[33] At the same time, he is the object of knowledge. Reasonable persons recognize God, his deeds, and his law.[34] Thus God is with them (1 S. 18:14; 2 K. 18:7), and they are successful.

Hence a certain concept underlies *śkl* uniting the various aspects "be reasonable–act reasonably–recognize God–keep God's commandments–have a successful life–acquire superiority." All these aspects resonate in any given instance even if one of them may occupy the foreground.

When the root *śkl* means "have insight" or "comprehend something," it is often

---

30. On Gen. 3:6 and Neh. 9:20 see IV.1.a,c below.
31. → חכם *ḥāḵam (chākham),* IV, 364-85.
32. See IV.1.c below.
33. See IV.1.e below.
34. See IV.1.a below.

closely associated with the roots *byn*, "understand" (13 times), *yd'*, "know" (11), *ḥkm*, "be wise" (7), and *r'h*, "see" (2); cf. esp. Dt. 32:29; 2 Ch. 2:11(12); Isa. 41:20; 44:18; Dnl. 1:4,17. Antonyms include the roots *ksl*, "be foolish" (Ps. 94:8; Prov. 23:9), *b'r*, "be dumb" (Ps. 94:8), *'wh*, "be disturbed" (Prov. 12:8), and *rš'*, "act wickedly" (Dnl. 12:10).[35] The negative pendant of the *maśkîl* in Prov. 10:5; 14:35; 17:2 is the disgraceful *mēḇîš*. When *śkl* means "give someone insight (into something)," synonyms include *yrh* hiphil, "teach, instruct," and *ngd* hiphil, "announce, proclaim." If *śkl* is to be understood in the sense of "be successful," parallel terms include *ṣlḥ*, "be successful" (Josh. 1:8; Dnl. 8:25[36]), *slp*, "cast down" (Prov. 21:12), and *ykl*, "overcome" (Jer. 20:11).[37] Antonyms include *kšl*, "stumble, go astray," and *bwš*, "be ashamed" (Jer. 20:11). In Isa. 52:13 *śkl* refers to the exaltation of the Servant of God. Parallel terms here include various verbs of raising (*rwm, nś', gbh;* cf. Job 17:4).[38]

IV. Use.

1. *Hiphil.* a. *Have Insight.* The term *hiśkîl* is often used absolutely, i.e., without any indication of an object of knowledge. In such cases the verb then refers to a person's insight in the general sense, to the use of common sense. It means "be reasonable, act reasonably," "be prudent, act prudently." The context shows what such action means in a concrete sense. It refers first of all to wholly secular prudence. A prudent person knows how to act in certain situations, e.g., when one must harvest (Prov. 10:5) and when one should keep silent (10:19). Such persons acquire respect. A prudent servant has the king's favor (14:35), and a prudent woman is a gift from God for her husband (19:14). The prudent person is successful, is able to live well in the larger sense, and has nothing to do with the realm of shadows (15:24; 21:16). Such success can also mean concrete material rewards. A prudent servant receives a portion of the inheritance just as does a son (17:2).

Such insight manifests itself not only in secular prudence, but also in a recognition of Yahweh. Prov. 1:3 shows how smooth the transition between these two spheres is, spheres generally separated in modern thought. The verse uses *hiśkîl* in a comprehensive sense. The book of Proverbs introduces itself as a book seeking to transmit *mûsār haśkēl*, instruction in being wise, and such wisdom includes appropriate behavior in daily life as well as the appropriate fear of God. In Jer. 3:15 Yahweh promises to give the eschatological Jerusalem shepherds "after my own heart" who will guide the people with understanding (not transmit understanding to the people[39]). In this context such understanding includes the appropriate Yahweh faith. Similar also is Jer. 23:5, where *hiśkîl* within a meaningful series of verbs (be prudent–exercise righteousness) cannot mean "be successful."[40]

---

35. Concerning *skl*, "be dumb," see I above.
36. See IV.2 below.
37. See *ILC*, I-II, 196-99.
38. See von Lips, 120-26.
39. Contra R. P. Carroll, *Jeremiah. OTL* (1986), 148.
40. Contra W. McKane, *Jeremiah I. ICC* (1986), 562.

Other passages focus on the theological aspect. Ps. 2 summons the kings of the nations to cease rebelling and rather to be reasonable and serve Yahweh (v. 10). Common sense demands that Yahweh be venerated. Only a fool believes that there is no God or that God does not see us. By contrast, a prudent person seeks God (Ps. 14:2 = 53:3[2];[41] 36:4[3]; 94:8). Because Job does not simply submit to God without criticism, he is accused in Job 34:35-37 of speaking without insight, i.e., like a fool. Job 22:2 also implies this charge, insisting that a reasonable person knows he can neither damage nor be of service to God.[42] Those who worship wooden figurines as gods (Isa. 44:18) or who boast of their own capabilities must be lacking reason. Jer. 9:22-23(23-24), warning against the latter, summons its readers in the wisdom style to boast only of that understanding whose tasks include recognition of Yahweh.[43]

Once human reason acknowledges Yahweh, other insights necessarily follow. According to Ps. 119:99, keeping the commandments is what distinguishes the person with insight. In Neh. 9:20 and Am. 5:13, it is the prudent person who understands the meaning of divine actions. According to Neh. 9:20,[44] during the wilderness wanderings Yahweh gave his people a good spirit to give them insight or to instruct them. Contextually the reference can only be to insight into Yahweh's divine care for them. Israel should recognize the meaning of the pillars of cloud and fire and let themselves be guided by them. Am. 5:13 expects that a prudent person, recognizing the justification of the divine punishment, will keep silent at the commencement of judgment.[45] According to Gen. 3:6, the tree of knowledge transmits knowledge enabling people to recognize good and evil.

In Gen. 3:6 comms. occasionally translate *neḥmāḏ lᵉhaśkîl* in the sense of "to consider, view as desirable" (LXX, Vg., Pesh.).[46] The term *hiśkîl,* however, does not yield the meaning "consider, view as";[47] though cf. Aram. *śkl* ithpaal. Hence *neḥmāḏ lᵉhaśkîl* does not represent a synonymous parallel to the preceding expression "delight to the eyes"; rather, the verse enumerates three characteristics of the tree, namely, that it offers tasty fruits, is a delight to the eyes, and is desirable to make a person wise.[48] Or, if the human being rather than the tree is the logical subject, it is about having success or similarly a person becoming wise, which seems contextually more appropriate.[49] As far as

---

41. See IV.1.b below.

42. N. C. Habel, *Job. OTL* (1985), 337-38, makes the former point; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 354-55, the latter.

43. See IV.1.b below.

44. See IV.1.c below.

45. See II.2 above.

46. *RHB,* I, 13; J. L. Seeligmann, "Erkenntnis Gottes und historisches Bewusstsein im alten Israel," *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen, 1977), 432.

47. A. Dillmann, *Genesis* (Eng. trans., 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1897), 152-53.

48. *KBL*², 922.

49. For the former see G. Pidoux, "Encore les deux arbres de Genèse 3!" *ZAW* 66 (1954) 41; cf. H. J. Stoebe, "Gut und Böse in der Jahwistischen Quelle des Pentateuch," *ZAW* 65 (1953) 200. For the latter see O. H. Steck, *Die Paradieserzählung. BSt* 60 (1970) 104 n. 229 = *Wahrnehmungen Gottes im AT. ThB* 70 (1982), 92-93 n. 229.

content is concerned, the desired knowledge can refer back to v. 5b and be a knowledge of good and evil, or can refer back to v. 5a and be an opening of the eyes.[50] Since even such "opening of the eyes" also refers to the knowledge of good and evil, *hiśkîl* in any case refers ultimately to precisely such knowledge.[51]

b. *Understand Something.* Frequently *hiśkîl* is accompanied by an indication of what it is a person is understanding, generally introduced by the accusative (Dt. 32:29; 2 Ch. 30:22; Job 34:27; Ps. 64:10[9]; 106:7; Dnl. 9:22), though sometimes by *b*ᵉ (Ps. 101:2; Dnl. 1:4,17; 9:13),[52] *'el* (Neh. 8:13; Ps. 41:2[1]), *'al* (1 Ch. 28:19; Prov. 16:20), a *kî* clause (Isa. 41:20), or in direct discourse (Dnl. 9:25ff.).

In Ps. 14:2 (= 53:3[2]); 32:8; and Jer. 9:23(24), the question arises whether *hiśkîl* is being used absolutely or whether the content of knowledge indicated in these passages by the subsequent verb is also to be applied to *hiśkîl.* In the first case, Jer. 9:23(24) would be translated, "to be prudent and to know me," and in the second, "to understand (me) and know me." In Ps. 14:2 (= 53:3[2]) the question is whether God is looking down from heaven to see if "there are any who are wise and seek after God," or is looking to see if "there are any who know (God) and seek after God." Because the indication of the content of knowledge in the case of *hiśkîl* always refers to extremely concrete knowledge, and yet the absolute use can also refer to the kind of basic recognition of Yahweh at issue in these passages, it is probably what is meant here as well. A different situation obtains in Ps. 32:8, which focuses on transmitting a specific type of knowledge, whence "I will make clear to you [not: make you clear in the sense of give you insight] and show you the way you should go."

The accusative object of *hiśkîl* or the object introduced by *b*ᵉ in 2 Ch. 30:22; Dnl. 1:4; 9:22 is a concept of knowledge *(ḥoḵmâ, bînâ, śeḵel)* and refers in that sense to comprehensive knowledge.

According to the MT of Ps. 41:2(1),[53] a person is the object of such knowledge. "Happy are those who recognize the poor," i.e., the distress of the poor, implying an ensuing offer of help to them. Except in 41:2(1), the objects of knowledge for *hiśkîl* are always of a theological nature. Differently than is the case with the absolute usage, here such knowledge always refers not to a fundamental recognition of Yahweh, but to knowledge of a quite concrete divine deed or of divine commandments.

Passages concerned with knowledge of Yahweh's deeds generally focus on his salvific deeds. The petitioner in Ps. 64:10(9) speaks about his rescue. Yahweh destroyed his enemies, and now the psalmist is proclaiming this divine deed.[54] Deutero-Isaiah wants the entire world to know that it is the hand of Yahweh that will bring about the imminent new exodus (41:20). In Dnl. 9:25 Daniel is to know the course of coming

50. So C. Dohmen, *Schöpfung und Tod. Die Entfaltung theologischer und anthropologischer Konzeptionen in Gen. 2/3. SBB* 17 (1988), 111.

51. On interpretations of the expression "knowledge of good and evil," → V, 464-65.

52. On Am. 5:13 see II.2 above.

53. On emendations cf., e.g., H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 174-75; M. Dahood, *Psalms I: 1–50. AB* 16 (1966), 249.

54. See IV.1.c below.

history. According to Ps. 106:7, the sin of the fathers was that they did not know (NRSV "consider") the wonderful works of Yahweh. Dnl. 9:13 may be meant similarly, where the author acknowledges that he did not recognize Yahweh's *'emeṯ*. Here the reference is either to Yahweh's faithfulness, which brings salvation, or to his trustworthiness, which will also carry out the impending judgment.[55] Knowledge of divine actions corresponds in Dt. 32:29 to insight into the powerlessness of human beings. Yahweh reflects within the framework of a conversation with himself whether he should perhaps not destroy Israel after all lest the nations, who lack all insight into their own powerlessness in the matter, boast of that deed themselves.

Alongside knowledge of Yahweh's deeds, other passages focus on knowledge of the divine commandments. In Ps. 32:8 Yahweh intends to make clear to the petitioner the way Yahweh wishes him to go.[56] The petitioner in 101:2 promises to recognize (NRSV "study") the way that is blameless in order to "walk with integrity of heart." By contrast, Job 34:27 says that the wicked do not recognize (NRSV "have no regard for") Yahweh's ways. Neh. 8:13 recounts that the heads of the ancestral houses gathered around Ezra in order to study the words of the law. To the four young men in Dnl. 1 Yahweh has "given insight into all the books" (v. 17; NRSV "gave skill in every aspect of literature"), the reference doubtless being to the books of divine instruction. Prov. 16:20 promises that those who know Yahweh's word will fare well. 1 Ch. 28:19 similarly says that David studied the writing he received from the hand of Yahweh describing all the works of the temple construction.

Because Prov. 16:20b is not promising anything greater than does v. 20a,[57] the verse is probably not an example of antithetical parallelism (McKane: "he who is quick to take a point prospers, but happy is he who trusts in Yahweh"), but rather of synonymous parallelism. The word to be known is not just any word, but Yahweh's or that of a wisdom teacher, the latter of which coincides with Yahweh's word in any case.

In 1 Ch. 28:19 *'ālāyw* can be associated with the preceding and then mean either that the writing came "to me/him" (i.e., David) or that Yahweh's hand rested "on me/him" (i.e., David).[58] It can also, however, be associated with the following *hiśkîl* (Masoretic accentuation).[59] If one understands it in the sense of a personal object, then either he (David) brought insight to him (Solomon), or he (Yahweh) brought insight to me/him (David),[60] though this view is weakened by the fact that *'al* never indicates the recipient of knowledge. More likely, *'al* refers to the previously mentioned writing and, like the expression *hiśkîl 'al/'el-dāḇār* in Prov. 16:20 and Neh. 8:13, indicates what it is that a person knows: "Everything was in a writing from Yahweh's hand; he [David]

55. See Lebram, *Daniel,* 23, 104.

56. See above and IV.1.e below.

57. McKane, *Proverbs,* 236, 498.

58. Cf. *KD,* in loc.; E. L. Curtis, *Chronicles. ICC* 11 (1910), 300; H. G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles. NCBC* (1982), 183. Concerning the text-critical problem, cf. D. Barthélmy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT. OBO* 50/1 (1982), 473.

59. J. Becker. *1 Chronik. NEB* 18 (1986), 111.

60. See I. Benzinger, *Die Bücher der Chronik. KHC* XX (1901), 67.

studied it *('ālāyw)*." Hence once need not follow K. Galling and construe the verse to mean that David had insight on the basis of it *('ālāyw)*.[61]

c. *Make Someone Insightful/Make Someone Understand Something.* The form *hiśkîl* can occasionally be translated causatively in the sense of "make someone have insight, give someone insight, into something/someone." Such is always the case, and (except for Ps. 64:10[9]) then only if there is a personal object.[62] The object always stands in the accusative (which is why 1 Ch. 28:19[63] and Prov. 21:11 do not belong here) and indicates to whom such insight or understanding is mediated. In Ps. 32:8 Yahweh gives the petitioner insight.[64] In Dnl. 9:22 Gabriel grants Daniel insight. Prov. 16:23 speaks about the mind and mouth in a personified form, adding that the mind of the wise bestows judiciousness upon their mouth (NRSV "makes their speech judicious"). In Neh. 9:20 the nominal suffix can indicate either the subject or the object, so that it remains unclear whether Yahweh has given a good spirit to the wilderness generation "so that they have insight" or "in order to make them insightful."

Ps. 64:10(9) relates that everyone mediates insight into Yahweh's salvific deed. The verse lacks a personal object, something contextually possible because the proclamation of Yahweh's salvific deed made by all people is not intended for any specific person. The causative meaning of *hiśkîl* here is suggested by the par. *ngd* hiphil. Hence the verse does not contain a hysteron proteron "proclaim-know," nor can there be any sequence "proclaim-know,"[65] since then a new subject would have to be introduced for the action of knowing. Rather, *hiśkîl* together with *higgîḏ* constitutes synonymous parallelism, with both verbs referring to the proclamation of a divine salvific deed.

d. *Be Successful.* The form *hiśkîl* refers both to the "deed" and to the "consequence of the deed," i.e., both to the state of being prudent and to the success deriving from such prudence; as such it can also mean "be successful." In such cases *hiśkîl* is generally used absolutely, though Dtr authors can use the accusative (Dt. 29:8[9]; 1 K. 2:3), *bᵉ* (Josh. 1:7; 2 K. 18:7; 1 S. 18:5?), or *lᵉ* (1 S. 18:14) to express the nature of that success.

When it means "be successful," *hiśkîl* refers first of all to a successful life characterized by blessings and well-being in the more comprehensive sense of the sort bestowed upon the wise person according to wisdom instruction (Prov. 21:11). Interpreters usually understand 21:11 to be saying that something is made clear to the wise. If one views the simple person in the preceding half-verse as the subject, then that person allegedly should learn from the fact that one mediates insight to the wise person.[66] The question arises, however, to what extent the simple person can learn something from the knowledge of the wise. If by contrast one views the wise person as the subject, then the proverb is using antithetical parallelism to point out that the wise do not learn

61. Galling, *Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia. ATD* 12 (1954), 69.
62. On Ps. 41:2(1) see IV.1.b.
63. For the former see IV.1.d; for the latter see IV.1.b.
64. See IV.1.e.
65. So L. Delekat, *Asylie und Schutzorakel am Zionheiligtum* (Leiden, 1967), 70.
66. See O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 246.

through chastisement, but rather by receiving insight or instruction.[67] The presence of the prep. *l^e*, which contra *BHS* should not be deleted, militates against both these views, however, since in the case of *hiśkîl* the person to whom insight is given would have to stand in the accusative.[68] Prov. 21:11 is probably rather saying that the simple person, who is the subject in both halves of the verse, learns in two ways: when the scoffer is punished and when "success [comes] to the wise."[69]

Dtr authors promise comprehensive success to those who keep the law.[70] They will succeed in everything they do (*kōl* in Dt. 29:8[9]; Josh. 1:7; 1 K. 2:3; 2 K. 18:7) because Yahweh is with them (2 K. 18:7). The shepherds of the people who do not inquire about Yahweh, however, will not prosper (Jer. 10:21). Not without a note of irony, Prov. 17:8 finds that bribery always brings success. The fourth Servant Song begins in the fashion of a superscription by asserting that the Servant will prosper and be exalted. Here too success is to be understood in a comprehensive sense.

Although there is no reason to emend *hiśkîl* in Isa. 52:13,[71] the meaning of *yaśkîl* is disputed. If one translates it in the sense of "be prudent/act prudently," then v. 13a focuses on the prudent way in which the Servant currently executes his office, and only in v. 13b on the resulting reward.[72] If by contrast one translates the verb as "be successful, prosper," then it refers to the future and means either that the Servant's mission will succeed (cf. 53:10b) or that after his sufferings he himself will succeed and see light (cf. 53:11).[73] The latter stands in the foreground if one views v. 13b as a synonymous parallel and construes an inclusio between v. 13 and 53:10a,11-12 encompassing the fourth Servant Song. Nonetheless, some scholars emphasize that the other aspects probably resonate as well.[74]

2 K. 18:7-8 illustrates Hezekiah's success by enumerating his military victories. Here one sees that *hiśkîl* can also be used in a specialized sense, namely, in reference to military success. 1 S. 18 uses *hiśkîl* 4 times in reference to David's successes against the Philistines. Jer. 50:9 compares the arrows of the nations advancing on Babylon to those of a successful warrior.[75] In the confessions Jeremiah describes Yahweh as a powerful warrior (20:11) who will destroy the prophet's enemies. They will *lōʾ hiśkîlû*,

---

67. W. Frankenberg, *Die Sprüche. HKAT* II/3,1 (1898), 121; cf. McKane, *Proverbs*, 550.

68. See *HAL*, III, 1328b; see IV.1.c above.

69. Cf. E. Bertheau, *Die Sprüche Salomos. EHAT* VII (1847), 81; M. Lambert, "Notes exégetiques," *REJ* 42 (1901) 266.

70. See II.2 above.

71. On the suggestions cf., e.g., D. Meinhold, "Miscellen," *ZAW* 21 (1901) 204-6; Driver, "Isaiah 52:13–53:12," 90-91.

72. Cf. J. A. Alexander, *Isaiah* II (New York, ²1875), 283-84; *KD*, in loc.; *KBL*², 922.

73. E. Kutsch, *Sein Leiden und Tod — Unser Heil. Eine Exegese von Jes 52,13–53,12. BSt* 52 (1967), 15-16.

74. Cf. R. N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40–66. NCBC* (1978), 169; H.-J. Hermisson, "Der Lohn des Knechts," *Die Botschaft und die Boten. FS H. W. Wolff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981), 284-85; W. A. M. Beuken, *Jesaja deel II B. POT* (1989), 47; O. H. Steck, "Aspekte des Gottesknechts in Jes 52,13–53,12," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 47; cf. also Nyberg, 44-45.

75. See II.2.b.

which in connection with the expressions of trust in v. 11 refers not to their lack of understanding but to their defeat.[76]

When Prov. 21:12 speaks about the success of the righteous over the wicked, it probably refers to the destruction of the wicked. The verse is not saying that the righteous person mediates insight to the house of the wicked — what insight would that be anyway? — or that the righteous person keeps an eye on the house of the wicked.[77] Instead of *lᵉ*, the accusative with a person would have to be used.[78] The term *maśkîl* is probably rather describing the righteous person as someone who is successful in battle.[79] Moreover, the meaning "be successful" is also found in the preceding verse (see above), and the parallelism also leads one to expect such a meaning. One should probably translate, "The righteous is successful over against the house of the wicked, casting the wicked down to ruin."

e. *The Subject.* The grammatical or logical subject of *hiśkîl* is always a human or divine being, the only exceptions being the "mind," which appears in Prov. 16:23 and Isa. 44:18 as the seat of prudence (cf. Job 17:4), and Job's own "words," which are without insight (34:35).[80]

When *hiśkîl* means "have insight" or "comprehend something," the subject is quite frequently a person within a basic wisdom context (e.g., Proverbs). In Isa. 41:20 it is all people or all nations in an explicitly universalistic sense (cf. Ps. 2:10). In the Psalms the petitioner or psalmist is often the subject (101:2; 119:99; cf. 32:8). The counterpart to the presence of such insight is often its absence in the wicked (Job 34:27; Ps. 36:4[3]; 94:8) or in the nations (Dt. 32:29[81]). Only Neh. 9:20; Ps. 106:7; Dnl. 9:13 speak about Israel's insight. Jer. 3:15 and 23:5 expect the future ruler of Israel to have insight. Specific individuals or groups include David (1 Ch. 28:19[82]), the Levites (2 Ch. 30:22), the heads of the ancestral houses (Neh. 8:13), Daniel and his companions (Dnl. 1:4,17; 9:25; cf. 9:22), as well as those "with insight" in Dnl. 11:33,35; 12:3,10.[83] Job himself appears as an individual without insight in Job 34:35.

When *hiśkîl* means "give someone insight," its subject can be Yahweh or some other heavenly being. In such cases *hiśkîl* refers to a revelatory event. Gabriel reveals the future to Daniel (Dnl. 9:22). In Neh. 9:20 either the spirit given by Yahweh or Yahweh himself is the logical subject of *hiśkîl* if the meaning here is "make someone insightful, give someone insight."[84] In Ps. 32:8 Yahweh assures the psalmist that he will show and

76. Contra W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 132; N. Ittman, *Die Konfessionen Jeremias. WMANT* 54 (1981), 75.

77. For the former see V. Hamp, *Das Buch der Sprüche. EB* (1949), 56. For the latter see B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* I/16 (²1963), 80; *HAL*, III, 1328b.

78. See IV.1.c above.

79. So McKane, *Proverbs*, 561; cf. Plöger, 246.

80. On Gen. 3:6 see IV.1.a.

81. See G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), in loc.; a different view is taken by S. R. Driver, *Deuteronomy. ICC* (³1902), 371.

82. See IV.1.b above.

83. See II.2 above.

84. See IV.1.c.

make clear to him the "way you should go." Here the "I" of the speaker can hardly refer to the grateful psalmist who would then, as an exception, be speaking to the community in the singular; rather, this thanksgiving hymn probably cites from a divine salvific oracle.[85]

In 1 Ch. 28:11-19 David gives Solomon the plans for the temple construction. Interpreters often consider Yahweh to be the subject of *hiśkîl* in v. 19.[86] On this view Yahweh made clear (i.e., revealed) in a writing everything mentioned in vv. 11-18. W. Rudolph believes the subject is the previously mentioned writing and suggests that *hiśkîl* is used here in an asyndetic relative clause referring to the writing received from Yahweh's hand making clear all the works involved in the temple construction.[87] David, too, can be the subject, in which case the verse is relating either that he made clear to Solomon *('ālāyw)* everything in a writing from the hand of Yahweh or that he himself had insight based on the writing received from Yahweh *('ālāyw)*.[88] If one views *hiśkîl 'ālāyw* parallel with *hiśkîl 'al/'el-dāḇār* (Neh. 8:13; Prov. 16:20), then the subject in v. 19bβ is indeed probably David, and the verse is saying that he (David) had insight into it (i.e., the writing) and studied it.[89]

When *hiśkîl* means "be successful, have success," subjects include especially Israel (Dt. 29:8[9]) and its political leaders (1 S. 18:5,14,15,30; Josh. 1:7,8; 1 K. 2:3; 2 K. 18:7; Jer. 10:21; cf. Jer. 50:9). Jeremiah is confident that his own enemies will not be successful (20:11). Isa. 52:13 corresponds to this notion in a reverse fashion, i.e., the Servant of God, persecuted like Jeremiah, will be the one who has success. In Proverbs it is the wise (21:11), the righteous (21:12), and — ironically — those who accept bribes (17:8) who have success.

2. *śeḵel/śēḵel*. Corresponding to the absolute use of the verb, *śeḵel* means "insightfulness," the capacity to understand something. The content of such insight can be something secular (1 S. 25:3; Prov. 12:8; etc.) or recognition of Yahweh or of his law (all 6 passages in the Chronicler's History). Such understanding prompts respect among one's fellows (Prov. 12:8; 13:15; cf. Job 17:4) and is a source of life for the person (Prov. 16:22; cf. 19:11).

The noun *śeḵel* can also mean "success." Those who fear God have great success (Ps. 111:10) and command respect (Prov. 3:4).[90] The terrible king in Dnl. 8:23ff. will fall prey to arrogance because of his success in destroying the holy ones.

The various interpretations of Dnl. 8:24b-25a, often based on textual emendation,

85. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), in loc. Cf. F. Crüsemann, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel. WMANT* 32 (1969), 238-39.

86. Cf. S. Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (New York, 1989), 468-69.

87. *Chronikbücher. HAT,* I/21 (1955), 188; cf. *HAL,* III, 1329a.

88. Galling, *Chronik, Esra, Nehemia,* 69.

89. See IV.1.b above.

90. On these texts see, respectively, H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), in loc.; McKane, *Proverbs,* 292.

usually construe *śiḵlô* as a *sensu malo* reference to the deceitful behavior of the tyrant.[91] If one retains the Hebrew text and its verse divisions, I believe the context suggests the meaning "(military) success" for *śeḵel,* i.e., "because of his success and because deceit succeeds under his hand, in his own mind he shall be great [arrogant]."

In 3 passages *śeḵel* is the subject in descriptions of the positive results of insightfulness. It is the object in 5 passages. With a verb of knowing, the expression "possess insightfulness" (2 Ch. 2:11[12]; 30:22; cf. 1 Ch. 26:14) emerges. Otherwise the passages are concerned with attaining insight or success (Neh. 8:8; Prov. 3:4) or with receiving them from Yahweh (1 Ch. 22:12). The term *śeḵel* is used as a *nomen rectum* with persons to express the latters' comprehensive insightfulness (1 S. 25:3; Ezra 8:18). When *śeḵel* itself is a *nomen regens,* then either a personal *nomen rectum* (Prov. 16:22; 19:11) or a corresponding suffix (Prov. 12:8; Dnl. 8:25) indicates who has such insight. The adj. *ṭôḇ* indicates an intensification when used with *śeḵel,* e.g., as a reference to good insight (NRSV "sense"; 2 Ch. 30:22; Prov. 13:15) or good success (Prov. 3:4); both interpretations are possible in Ps. 111:10.[92]

3. *maśkîl.* The Psalm superscriptions use the technical term *maśkîl* 13 times (Ps. 32; 42–45; 52–55; 74; 78; 88; 89; 142). Am. 5:13 does not belong in this context.[93] The term also appears in Ps. 47:8(7), where the community is summoned to sing a *maśkîl* to Yahweh. Here the term is neither an adverb ("sing wisely!"; so Tgs., LXX, Vg., Luther) nor a vocative ("play, you who are knowledgeable [in music]!"), but rather the accusative object.[94] The meaning of *maśkîl* is unclear. If one derives it from *śkl* I, three interpretations are possible.

First, taking the verb meaning "have insight" as one's point of departure, a *maśkîl* is then an insightfully composed song, i.e., a song composed in a particularly artistic fashion, a *Kunstlied.*[95]

Second, taking the verb meaning "make insightful" as one's point of departure, a *maśkîl* is then a song that makes someone insightful, i.e., a didactic poem or a wisdom psalm.[96] Militating against this view, however, is that the psalms bearing the superscription *maśkîl* are the last ones anyone would identify as didactic poems. Ahlström suggests that the reference is to instruction in the broader sense, with *śkl* referring to knowledge about life and death.[97] The superscription *maśkîl* shows that the psalm in question finds its life setting in the ritual of life renewal and contains either a petition for or the assurance of life. Maag translates "instructive piece" rather than "didactic poem," suggesting that the term *maśkîl,* which was added only at a very late date, does

---

91. See B. Hasselberger, *Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis. ATS* 4 (1977), 12, 68.

92. See *HAL,* III, 1329-30.

93. Contra E. Sellin, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch. KAT* XII/1 (1922), 239-40; see II.2.

94. On the adverb see R. Kittel, *Die Psalmen. KAT* XIII (^{2}1914), 185. On the vocative see Maag, 113; *KBL*^{2}, 571.

95. See Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* in loc.

96. So E. König, *Die Psalmen* (Gütersloh, 1927), 39.

97. Ahlström, 24-25.

not mean that the psalms in question were composed for didactic purposes, but rather that they were later used for instruction in schools.[98]

Third, Delekat begins with *śkl* meaning "be successful" and suggests that *maśkîl* refers to a successful song in the sense of a popular hit.

These interpretations deriving from *śkl* I are countered by Koenen's derivation from *śkl* II, "cross over." Because in Syriac *śkl* II is translated as *ḥlp* shaphel (Gen. 48:14), *maśkîl* could, like Syr. *šwḥlpy ql'*, refer to an antiphonal (chant).

The unanswered question amid all these interpretations is just what specific feature the 13 *maśkîl* psalms share. Why are they and only they specifically called *maśkîl* psalms, and why does Ps. 53 bear the superscription *maśkîl* while the equivalent Ps. 14 does not?

4. *Aram. Hithpael and śoḵlᵉṯānû.* In Biblical Aramaic, *śkl* hithpael means "observe, see" (Dnl. 7:8). The abstract noun *śoḵlᵉṯānû* in 5:11,12,14 refers to Daniel's insightfulness as concretely manifested in his ability to interpret dreams.

V. Qumran. Because instruction was extremely important in Qumran, it is not surprising that the root *śkl* occurs quite frequently. Although the verb can mean "pay attention, note" (4Q185 1-2, I, 13; 4Q381 76-77, 8), "have insight" (1QH 10:6), and "comprehend something" (1QS 11:18; 4Q381 69:7), it is used particularly with the causative meaning "instruct." Subjects of such instruction include especially God (1QS 4:22; 1QH 10:4,7; 11:4,10,28; 4Q381 15:8; 44:4; 11QPsᵃ 19:3), the *maśkîl* (see below), adults who instruct the younger generation (1QSa 1:7; cf. 4Q381 15:8; 45:1; 47:3 with "I"), the prophets (4Q381 69:4,5a), and (personified) Wisdom (11QPsᵃ 18:5). The objects of such instruction include the correct knowledge of God (1QS 4:22), the wondrous mysteries of the divine plan of salvation, the correct behavior in the end time (1QS 9:12ff.; cf. 11QMelch 2:20), and the law (1QSa 1:7). The Qumranites are no longer concerned with secular, but rather with eschatologically relevant insight.[99] According to 4Q402 4:14-15 par. ShirShab 1:5-6, even the wise in their own wisdom cannot fathom the divine mysteries; even with the aid of divine revelation, the full dimension of God's intentions remains hidden even to the wise.[100]

The noun means "insight" (1QS 2:3; 4:3; 1QH 14:27; 17:21; 4Q401 35:1 par. *d't;* 4Q502 2:4 par. *bynh*), as is appropriate for God and people. God has established the plan of history in the mysteries of his understanding (1QS 4:18; 1QH 13:13; 4Q405 23, II, 13) and reveals to the *maśkîl* the mysteries of that understanding (1QH 9:31; 12:13). People, especially novices, are judged according to their understanding and their works (1QS 5:20ff.; 6:14,18; 1QSa 1:17; CD 13:11; cf. 1QH 12:22; 14:19; 1QH fr. 11:4[101]). Commensurate with their understanding, they praise God (1QH 1:31; 11:25; 1QH fr.

---

98. Maag, 112.

99. See M. Weise, *Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der "Ordensregel" vom Toten Meer* (Leiden, 1961), 88.

100. See C. A. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.* HSS 27 (1985), 162.

101. F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Text. BBB* 10 (1956), 56.

10:4). In the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, those with insight *(gbwry śkl)* receive the blessing (4Q403 1, I, 21 par.).

The term *maśkîl,* rather than referring to a single, specific person,[102] probably refers rather to the office or rank of a teacher (cf. the *maśkîlîm* in Daniel[103]), a layperson in a special position who dispenses blessing to those who fear God, to priests, and to princes (1QSb 1:1; 3:22; 5:20), but who above all learns (1QS 9:13; 4Q510 1:4) and teaches (1QS 3:13; 9:12ff.; CD 12:21; 13:22) God's mysteries and laws. In 4Q511 2, I, 1 et passim (Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice), he appears as the composer of a song. Newsom emphasizes his significance with regard to the structure and hierarchical organization of the community.

Koenen

---

102. So Hempel, 207-8.
103. Nötscher, 56-57.

שָׂכַר *śāḵar;* שָׂכִיר *śāḵîr;* שֶׂכֶר *śeḵer;* שָׂכָר *śāḵār;* מַשְׂכֹּרֶת *maśkōreṯ;* אֶשְׁכָּר *'eškār*

Contents: I. Root: 1. Akk. *iškāru;* 2. Ugar. *škr;* 3. Aram. *śkr* > *skr;* 4. Arabic, Ethiopic, Phoenician. II. Use of the Verb. III. Use of the Noun: 1. *śāḵîr;* 2. *śeḵer* and *śāḵār;* 3. *maśkōreṯ.* IV. Mishnah and Qumran.

I. Root. The root *śkr* is attested in Hebrew, Phoenician, Aramaic, Arabic, South Arabian, and Ethiopic; from here it passed into Demotic and Coptic.[1] The essential semantic component is probably "compensate in kind," whence developed the meanings "pay, compensate" or "hire, engage," though also "thank" and, by contrast, "mistreat."

śāḵar. A. Ben-David, *Talmudische Ökonomie I* (New York, 1974), esp. 61-69; W. Bienert, *Die Arbeit nach der Lehre der Bibel* (Stuttgart, ²1956), esp. 88-96; F. M. Fales, "Kilamuwa and the Foreign Kings: Propaganda vs. Power," *WO* 10 (1979) 6-22, esp. 16-18; K. Fuchs, "Die alttestamentliche Arbeitergesetzgebung im Vergleich zum Codex Hammurapi, zum altassyrischen und hethitischen Recht" (diss., Heidelberg, 1935); G. Garbini, "L'iscrizione fenicia di Kilamuwa e il verbo *škr* in semitico occidentale," *BeO* 19 (1977) 113-18; W. Lauterbach, "Der Arbeiter in Recht und Rechtspraxis des AT und des Alten Orients" (diss., Heidelberg, 1935); E. Lipiński, "From Karatepe to Pyrgi. Middle Phoenician Miscellanea," *RSF* 2 (1974) 45-61, esp. 50; idem, "Emprunts suméro-akkadiens en hébreu biblique," *ZAH* 1 (1988) 61-73, esp. 64; D. Sperber, *Roman Palestine 200–400: Money and Prices* (Ramat-Gan, 1974), esp. 101-2, 122-25, 251-52; P. Swiggers, "Commentaire philologique sur l'inscription phénicienne du roi Kilamuwa," *RSF* 11 (1983) 133-47, esp. 140-41.

1. See *HAL,* III, 1330-31.

1. *Akk. iškāru.* The existence of this root in Old Akkadian might be taken into consideration given the use of the logogram ÉŠ.GÀR for *iškāru,* "delivery, allotment, tribute."[2] However, the word is generally identified as Sumerian,[3] and its Semitic origin is rather improbable. The root *śkr* basically means "reward, compensate." Hence it is difficult to associate the Akkadian lexeme *iškāru* with this root.[4]

The Hebrew loanword *'eškār,* "tribute" (Ps. 72:10; Ezk. 27:15), which the LXX translates as *misthós,* "wage" (Ezk. 27:15), or *dō̃ra,* "gifts" (Ps. 72:10), is also attested on an ostracon from Kadesh-barnea dating probably to the beginning of the Persian period.[5] Similarly Aram. *'eškārā',* "(awarded, granted) field,"[6] is doubtless a lexical loan from Neo-Babylonian, which attests the two meanings "tribute" and "field." If these terms were deriving from *śkr,* one would expect **'eśkār* in Hebrew and **'eskārā'* in Aramaic. One can further consider the direct origin of Demotic *škr,* "tax, tribute," and Copt. *škor,* "rent, lease."[7] From a semantic perspective, Akk. *iškāru* offers the best explanation, and *škr/škor* can in fact be pronounced as *eškar/eškor.*

2. *Ugar. škr.* The occurrence of *škr* in Ugaritic is questionable. The only sentence possibly attesting this root reads *'lmnt škr tškr,* often translated as "the widow hires herself out"[8] or "the widow hires a hireling."[9] However, the parallel clause *yḥd bth sgr* or *'ḥd bth ysgr,* "the lonely one closes his house,"[10] shows that one should interpret the half-verse in question in the sense of "the widow locks herself in with the bolt." It seems one must reckon with the existence of a West and South Semitic variant *škr* of the vb. *sg/kr,* "close." Its existence in a South Arabian inscription *(s^1kr)* seems secure,[11] and *šakāru,* "shut away," probably exists in Amorite as suggested by a tablet from Mari, where the cuneiform *áš* and *èš* should be read instead of *ás* and *ès.* The text speaks of gold that has been shut away:[12] *áš-ke-er-šu,* "I shut it away," *ša èš-ki-ru,* "which I have shut away." On the other hand, the Akk. vb. *sekēru* is used in Mari in the sense of "wall up, stop up, bolt shut" in reference to a breach and water.[13] The same vb. *šakāru,* "enclose, shut in," occurs in *KTU* 1.14, II, 44-45; IV, 22-23, showing that the root *śkr* has in fact not yet been attested in Ugaritic.

---

2. I. J. Gelb, *Glossary of Old Akkadian* (Chicago, 1957), 75.

3. S. Lieberman, *The Sumerian Loanwords in Old-Babylonian Akkadian. HSS* 22 (1977), 235-36, no. 192.

4. *CAD,* VII, 244-50; *AHw,* I, 395-96.

5. See R. Cohen, *Kadesh Barnea* (Jerusalem, 1983), XIX and 38, no. 37.

6. See S. A. Kaufman, *The Accadian Influence in Aramaic. AS* 19 (1974), 59.

7. W. Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar* (Copenhagen, 1954), 525; J. Černý, *Coptic Etymological Dictionary* (Cambridge, 1976), 264; W. Vycichl, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue copte* (Louvain, 1983), 279.

8. *KTU* 1.14, II, 44-45; IV, 22-23.

9. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1330a; M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, "Der Ausmarsch des Heeres im Keret-Epos," *UF* 12 (1980) 195-96.

10. *KTU* 1.14, II, 43; IV, 21.

11. Beeston, 125; Biella, 334.

12. *ARM,* XIII, 6 11,19.

13. *ARM,* III, 4 16; 5 42; VI, 4 17; 8 11,13; 9 13; 10 10; 11 5; 12 15,17.

3. *Aram. śkr > skr.* In Aramaic the vb. *śkr > skr* probably means "compensate, reward," rather than "congratulate someone on," as suggested by J. Starcky: *w'l hnn shd lh 'lh' [w]skrt lh md yth,* "hence God gave him a witness, and the city rewarded him."[14] Accordingly in Palmyrene the adj. *skr'/škr',* pl. *skry'/škry',* always designates God as the "rewarder"; it should probably be interpreted as the act. ptcp. *śākrā'/śākrayyā'* in the emphatic state. The word *škr* may also occur on an ostracon from Elephantine in the sense of "wage," though the context is difficult to interpret, as it also is in the case of a Palmyrene inscription from Dura Europa, where *ṭb wskr'* should mean "good and rewarding."[15]

4. *Arabic, Ethiopic, Phoenician.* In Classical Arabic the vb. *šakara* means "thank,"[16] which is close to its basic meaning and may imply the presentation of a gift or reward. The semantic connection with the meaning "reward, reimburse" is thus clear. An antithetical meaning of the vb. *s²kr,* "strike, hit," or "mistreat someone," occurs in a South Arabian inscription[17] and can be derived directly from the more general sense of "compensate in kind." Moreover, Eth. *šᵉkūr,* "wage earner" (Isa. 7:20), and Amhar. *ašker,* "domestic servant," emphasize their derivation from the meaning "engage, hire," which it exhibits in Hebrew and in the only Phoenician witness: *wškr 'nk 'ly mlk 'šr,* "and I hired the king of Assyria against him."[18] This meaning of *škr* in Phoenician is confirmed by the use of the same syntagma *śkr 'l* in 2 K. 7:6 as well as in Dt. 23:5(Eng. 4), Neh. 13:2, and in Ezra 4:5, where the vb. *śkr* appears in the Aramaic form *skr,* reading *sōḵᵉrîm ʿᵃlêhem yôʿᵃṣîm,* "they hire counselors against them." Garbini's translation of *wškr 'nk 'ly mlk 'šr* as "I am richer than the king of Assyria" has been shown to be incorrect.[19]

II. Use of the Verb. In the OT the vb. *śkr* in the qal means "engage, hire," a person (never a thing) for a certain activity. The LXX correspondingly translates it with *misthoún,* "hire" (Gen. 30:16; Dt. 23:5[4]; Jgs. 9:4; 18:4; 2 S. 10:6; 2 K. 7:6; 1 Ch. 19:6-7; 2 Ch. 24:12; 25:6; Neh. 6:12-13; Isa. 46:6). Hence the king of Moab "hires" Balaam to curse Israel (Dt. 23:5[4]; Neh. 13:2; cf. Nu. 22:5ff.), and Nehemiah's adversaries "hire" a prophet from Jerusalem (Neh. 6:12-13). Abimelech "hired" the adventurers who had joined him (Jgs. 9:4), and Micah "hired" a priest (18:4) for ten pieces of silver a year (17:10) to perform duties at his private sanctuary. The Ammonites "hire" Aramean troops in preparation for the war against David (2 S. 10:6; 1 Ch. 19:6-7), and

---

14. *DNSI,* II, 1135; cf. Starcky, *Inventaire des inscriptions de Palmyre X* (Damascus, 1949), 115.2.

15. On the former see *ESE,* II, 238.3; *TAD* D7.9, 3 ("beer"); on the latter, *DNSI,* II, 1135; PAT 1081.4.

16. Lane, I/4, 1584; Wehr, 482.

17. Beeston, 132.

18. *KAI* 24.7-8. See *LexLingAeth,* 255; W. Leslau, *Concise Amharic Dictionary* (Berkeley, 1976), 132.

19. Garbini, 118; cf. D. S. Sperling, "KAI 24 Re-Examined," *UF* 20 (1988) 332.

King Amaziah "hires" one hundred thousand Israelite warriors for one hundred talents of silver (2 Ch. 25:6). The unexpected arrival of auxiliary troops, probably Assyrians, causes the Arameans besieging Samaria to believe that the "king of Israel has hired the kings of the Hittites and the kings of Egypt to fight against us" (2 K. 7:6). The same picture is attested in the 9th-century Phoenician text of Kilamuwa, who boasts that he has "hired" the king of Assyria against the king of the Danunians.[20] In order to restore the temple during the reign of Joash, those in charge "hire" masons and carpenters (2 Ch. 24:12). Those who worship idols "hire" a goldsmith to make the god (Isa. 46:6), and the wise one reproaches those who "hire a passing fool or passersby" (Prov. 26:10; the text is corrupt; LXX misreads the initial *weśōḵēr* as *bāśār* and the second as *šāḇar,* "break into pieces," and translates "all the flesh of fools is quite confused, since their drunkenness is broken").

Finally, the name Issachar in Gen. 30:16-18 is explained by the vb. *śkr* with the particle *beth pretii,* "wage for."

In the niphal (1 S. 2:5) and hithpael (Hag. 1:6), the vb. *śkr* exhibits the passive sense of "hire oneself out." In her thanksgiving hymn, Hannah sings about God's reversal of circumstances: "Those who had plenty hire themselves out for bread" (1 S. 2:5). The economic crisis at the beginning of the restoration prompts the hireling to hire himself out for a "bag with holes" (Hag. 1:6). The niphal of *śkr* in 1 S. 2:5 is often interpreted following the LXX *elattoún* in the sense of "humiliate oneself"; the circumscription *misthoús synágōn,* "accumulate wages," renders the ptcp. *miśtakkēr* in Hag. 1:6.

III. Use of the Noun. 1. *śāḵîr.* The subst. adj. *śāḵîr* means (in a pass. sense) "hireling" and especially "mercenary" in an army (Jer. 46:21; cf. 2 Ch. 25:6). This word is usually rendered in Greek by *misthōtós,* which has the same meaning (Ex. 12:45; 22:14[15]; Lev. 19:13; 22:10; 25:6,40,53; Dt. 15:18; Job 7:2; 14:6; Isa. 16:14; 21:16; Jer. 46:21; Mal. 3:5), though on occasion by *místhios* (Lev. 25:50; Job 7:1; Sir. 7:20; 37:11; cf. Sir. 34:22), a synonym derived from the same root. This word refers to a "hireling," i.e., a free man who hires himself out for a limited period to perform a specific piece of work for an agreed price. Such a hireling differs from the slave, who largely performed the same kind of work, in that the hireling has the status of a freeman.[21] Alien residents or transients offered their services in this way (Ex. 12:45; Lev. 22:10; Dt. 24:14), just as Jacob did with Laban (Gen. 29:15; 30:28; 31:7). On the other hand, the impoverishment of certain families, particularly during the 8th century, and the loss of their impounded and ultimately confiscated land prompted an increasing number of Judeans and Israelites to work for wages. Although it may be such a hireling that complains on the ostracon of Mesad Hashavyahu, it is more likely a corvée worker.[22]

---

20. *KAI* 24.7-8; *ANET,* 654.
21. F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (^{4}1983), 114; cf. *HAL,* III, 1327b.
22. See D. Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters. SBLSBS* 15 (1982), no. 1.

Hirelings include especially seasonal laborers who then work in the fields (cf. Job 7:1), are engaged as reapers (2 K. 4:18), grape pickers (Mt. 20:1-16), or gleaners (Ruth 2:3-4), or who care for the flocks (Am. 3:12). They can be contracted for a day as "day laborers" (Lev. 19:13; Dt. 24:15; Job 14:6; cf. Mt. 20:8) or for a year (Lev. 25:50,53; Isa. 16:14; 21:16; Sir. 37:11). The OT provides no direct information about the amount of wages except for the priest who serves Micah (Jgs. 17:10) and then in a more general sense in the case of Amaziah's mercenaries (2 Ch. 25:6). In Mesopotamia hirelings were paid both in natural produce and with money. For example, the Laws of Eshnunna fix the daily wage of a boatman (§4) at eleven *qa* of barley (about 9.24 liters), that of a donkey driver (§10) at ten *qa* of barley (about 8.4 liters), and the monthly wage of a harvester (§§9,11) at a shekel of silver and sixty *qa* of barley (about 50.5 liters).[23] According to CH §273, a laborer is to receive one shekel of silver per month during the five months of most intensive work, and 5/6 of a shekel per month during the rest of the year, though certain contracts also fix the sums a bit lower. By fixing a yearly wage at about ten shekels, this paragraph from the Code of Hammurabi resembles the text of Dt. 15:18 according to which in six years a slave delivers to his master double the wages of a hireling. The price of a slave was indeed 30 shekels (Ex. 21:32), corresponding to a wage of three years. The vineyard laborers in Mt. 20:2 earn a denarius, which stands for a much higher wage even though it is illusory to compare the prices in the 2nd millennium B.C.E. with those from a period during Roman rule (cf. Sperber). The situation of the hireling was not an enviable one (Job 7:1-2; 14:6; Mal. 3:5; Sir. 7:20), and unjust masters often did not even pay what was appropriate (Jer. 22:13; Sir. 34:22). Hirelings were, however, protected by law, which paid them special attention. Both Lev. 19:13 and Dt. 24:15 demand that laborers be paid their wages every evening (cf. Tob. 4:14; Mt. 20:8).

Even if a laborer lives with his employer (Lev. 25:6,40), he is still paid according to the number of workdays (25:50), though he is not permitted to participate in the family Passover celebration (Ex. 12:45) or to eat the sacred food if he is employed by a priest (Lev. 22:10). The case of the laborer in Dt. 24:14 is of particular interest in that the use of the vb. *ʿāšaq* gives the impression that the case involves a surety or pledge confiscated by a creditor. According to the Hebrew text, the case involves the seizure of a person, "a poor or needy laborer." The LXX no longer understood the legal scope of this prohibition and read *śāḵār,* "wage" *(misthós),* instead of *śāḵîr,* "wage earner": "You shall not confiscate the wages of a poor person and of a needy person."

Two texts are difficult to interpret: Ex. 22:14b(15b) and Isa. 7:20.[24] The stipulation *ʾim-śāḵîr hûʾ bāʾ biśeḵārô* in Ex. 22:14b(15b) cannot refer to the hired animal, but must refer to the owner of the animal who accompanies it as the hired driver as in the Laws of Eshnunna §3 and CH §271 regulating the hiring of a "wagon together with its oxen and its driver." If the owner is responsible for the animals he is driving at the moment

23. *ANET,* 161-62.

24. See in this regard E. Otto, *Wandel der Rechtsbegründungen in der Gesellschaftsgeschichte des antiken Israel. StBib* 3 (1988), 15, 19.

of the accident, he nonetheless can claim his wage as a driver, regardless of what happened to the animals. The metaphor in Isa. 7:20, *ta'ar haśś^e^ḵîrâ,* speaks about a "razor hired beyond the river" (so the usual interpretation). The construct expression (masc. *nomen regens* with a fem. *nomen rectum ś^e^ḵîrâ*), however, might be understood as a "knife of hiring"[25] or, more likely, "knife of the [female] laborer," since *ś^e^ḵîrâ* is unknown with the meaning "hiring." Perhaps *ś^e^ḵîrâ* refers here to Assyria (fem.); "the king of Assyria" would then be merely an explicative gloss. The LXX read *šikkôr,* "drunken" *(memethysménos),* instead of *śāḵîr,* prompting some to emend the text of Isa. 7:20 accordingly.

2. *śeḵer and śāḵār.* The noun *śeḵer,* "reward, wage," appears only in Isa. 19:10 and Prov. 11:18,[26] whereas *śāḵār* occurs 28 times in the OT in the sense of "wage." Both words are consistently rendered in Greek as *misthós,* "wage" (Gen. 15:1; 30:18,28, 32,33; 31:8[bis]; Ex. 2:9; 22:14[15]; Nu. 18:31; Dt. 15:18; 24:15; 1 K. 5:20[6]; 2 Ch. 15:7; Ps. 127:3; Prov. 11:18; Eccl. 4:9; 9:5; Isa. 40:10; 62:11; Jer. 31:16; Ezk. 29:18,19; Zech. 8:10[bis]; 11:12; Mal. 3:5; cf. Sir. 11:18; 34:22; 51:22,30; Tob. 4:14), with the exception of Jon. 1:3, where the LXX uses the specific term *naúlon/naúlos,* "boat fare, boat freight fee," and Isa. 19:10, where the use of *śeḵer* is uncertain. Contra MT, the latter passage does not involve the *'ōśê śeḵer,* "hired laborers," but rather the *'ōśê šēḵār,* "producers of strong drinks," as suggested by the LXX *(zýthon poioúntes),* Pesh., and the contrasting image of the despairing brewer.

Gen. 30:18 views Issachar as Leah's "reward" (*śāḵār;* NRSV "hire"). This verse is using wordplay, since a descendant is a "reward" (Ps. 127:3), like the one God promises to Abraham (Gen. 15:1). Elsewhere *śāḵār* refers to the "wages" of Moses' nurse (Ex. 2:9) or to the price paid to a laborer for performing a specified task, meanings that the word usually exhibits (Dt. 15:18; 24:15; Eccl. 4:9; Zech. 8:10; Mal. 3:5). As such it refers to the wage of the driver (Ex. 22:14[15]), of the Phoenician carpenters (1 K. 5:20[6]), and of the shepherd (Zech. 11:12), and to the fare for a boat trip (Jon. 1:3). Jacob's wages (Gen. 30:28,32,33) consist of black sheep and spotted and speckled goats. The tithe for the sanctuary provides the pay for the Levites (Nu. 18:31).

Metaphorically *śāḵār* can refer to the price of victory (Isa. 40:10; 62:11), the spoils of an army (Ezk. 29:18-19), compensation for one's trouble (Jer. 31:16), and the reward for loyalty to Yahweh (1 Ch. 15:7). On the other hand, the price of miserliness is the forced surrender of all one's goods at the moment of death (Sir. 11:18). The dead receive no more reward, since memory of them grows weaker (Eccl. 9:5).

3. *maśkōreṯ.* Yet another substantive meaning "wage, reward" is *maśkōreṯ.* In Gen. 29:15; 31:7,41 it refers to "wages" for Jacob consisting of Laban's two daughters and his flock. The expression also appears in Ruth 2:12, where it refers to Ruth's reward.

---

25. *HAL,* III, 1328a.
26. *HAL,* III, 1331b.

IV. Mishnah and Qumran. The root *śkr* is rarely used in Qumran. By contrast, the Mishnah, Tosephta, and Talmud extensively use both the verb and the nouns derived from the root.[27] The Mishnah (e.g., *Bab. Meṣ.* 6–8) uses it several times in reference to labor contracts involving craftsmen, a donkey driver, or a driver whom someone has "hired" *(haśśôḵēr),* also laborers hired to perform an urgent piece of work (6:1). The texts establish the responsibilities of those who hire a donkey or ox to perform a specific task; such responsibilities depend on the extent to which the work carried out by the contractee and the animals corresponds to the stipulations of the contract itself (6:3-5). Local usage serves as the criterion for interpreting the contract (7:1), and legislation determines the rights of the laborers engaged in agricultural work with respect to their partaking of the produce of the field (7:2-8). One passage deals in great detail with the case of the lost animal, addressed in Ex. 22:13-14(14-15), taking into consideration various possible situations and differentiating contractual hiring from a loan (8:1ff.); the owner is responsible for his animal only if he has accompanied it from the very first moment of its use by the person who has hired or borrowed it.

Although the hiphil of *śkr* is not attested in the OT, it does appear in postbiblical texts. The same mishnaic tractate, *Bab. Meṣia,* uses *hiśkîr* to mean "lease," establishing thus the obligations of those who lease a house (*hammaśkîr,* 8:6-9) and regulating the difficult case of a contract that includes a sabbath year (8:8). The statute for "hired laborer, a wage worker," *śāḵîr,* makes various distinctions: *śᵉḵîr yôm,* "day laborer"; *śᵉḵîr laylâ,* "night laborer"; *śᵉḵîr šāʿôṯ,* "person hired for hourly wage"; *śᵉḵîr šᵉḇûaʿ,* "person hired for weekly wage"; *śᵉḵîr ḥōḏeš,* "person hired for monthly wage"; *śᵉḵîr šānâ,* "person hired for yearly wage" (*Bab. Meṣ.* 9:11). The guardian hired for a wage is called *nôśēʾ śāḵār,* lit. the "bearer of the wage" (*Bab. Meṣ.* 7:8; *Šebu.* 8:1,6). Rabbi Tarfon (1st century C.E.), addressing those who study the law diligently, says, "Faithful is your taskmaster who shall pay you the reward of your labor *(śᵉḵar pᵉʿullāṯᵉḵā)*" (*'Abot* 2:16).

In sectarian writings, the subst. *śkr* appears with the meaning "wages for labor." The regulation of CD 14:12-13 requires that every member of the community hand over the earnings of at least two days out of every month to support orphans, the poor, and the stricken. Although the ptcp. *śwkrw* in CD 11:12 is often translated as "his wage worker,"[28] during the mishnaic period the *śôḵēr* was actually a lessee or usufructuary of estates for which he paid rent or a leasing fee, while the *ḥāḵîr, ḥāḵûr,* or *ḥôḵēr* was a lessee who shared the produce of the leased land with the owner (Jer. *Dem.* 6:1; Tos. *Dem.* 6:2). In CD 11:12 the subst. ptcp. *śwkrw* should thus be translated as "his tenant/lessee" in parallel with "manservant" and "maidservant": "No man shall chide his manservant or maidservant or tenant on the Sabbath."

A comparison of the variants *śkyr* and *śwkr* in the Hebrew mss. to Sir. 7:20 is interesting. Although ms. D mentions "the wage worker *(śāḵîr)* who sells his soul," ms. A supports the Greek text by referring to the "tenant/lessee *(śôḵēr)* who sells his soul."

---

27. Cf. *WTM,* IV, 555-56; Jastrow, 1573, 1575-76.
28. See Lohse, 89.

Here one must also mention the use of *śkr* in 11QPs[a] 22:1, which corresponds to Sir. 51:30. The poem in Sir. 51:13-30 about the search for wisdom, which belongs wholly to the psalter of 11QPs[a], mentions the *śāḵār* on two occasions. Here the term refers to the "reward" of those who seek true wisdom.

Lipiński

שְׂלָו *śᵉlāw*

Contents: I. Philological Considerations: 1. Occurrences and Form; 2. Etymology; 3. LXX. II. Zoological Considerations. III. OT Quail Narratives: 1. Ex. 16; 2. Nu. 11: a. Basic Narrative; b. Spiritualized Expansion.

I. Philological Considerations.

1. *Occurrences and Form.* The lexeme *śᵉlāw,* colloquially known as the "quail" *(coturnix communis),* occurs 4 times in the OT, always in connection with the manna (Ex. 16:13; Nu. 11:31,32; Ps. 105:40).

Both Tg. Neofiti I and Pesh. spell it with *samekh* and (like Sam. *ślwy* and Arab. *slwy*) with a *yodh* at the end. The various mss. and the Talmud (Bab. *Yoma* 75b) that read *ślyw* in Nu. 11:32 and Ps. 105:40 should thus be emended to *ślwy.* Perhaps **śalway* is thus to be posited as the original form.[1]

The word apparently has its origin in Hebrew, whence it probably passed into Aramaic *(sᵉlāw/ślwy/sᵉlāyw)* and Syriac *(salway),* and from there into Arabic (*salwā,* Sura 2.57; 7.160; 20.80).[2]

2. *Etymology.* Because it does not occur in other Semitic languages, the etymology of *śᵉlāw* is unclear. P. de Lagarde suggested an explanation based on Arab. *salwā,* which can mean both "quail" and "comfort, relief," an etymological derivation to which Wis. 19:12 may allude when the quail come up to the Israelites from the sea *eis*

śᵉlāw. J. Aḥituv, "*Śālāw,*" *EMiqr,* VIII, 306-7; G. Brunet, "Les cailles et la colère de Yhwh (Nombres XI, 31-34)," *Cahiers du Cercle Ernest-Renan* 28/116 (1980) 152-58; G. S. Cansdale, *Animals of the Bible Lands* (Exeter, 1970), esp. 167-68; G. Dalman, *AuS,* I/1 (1928), esp. 168-69; V. Fritz, *Israel in der Wüste. Marburger theologische Studien* 7 (1970), esp. 70-75; C. S. Jarvis, *Yesterday and Today in Sinai* (Edinburgh, ³1933), 258-64; Y. Leshem, "Quail Nets in Northern Sinai," *Teva Vaarets* 20 (1978) 5-7 (Heb.); P. Maiberger, *Das Manna. ÄAT* 6/1+2 (1983), esp. 170-77, 493-98; H. Mendelssohn, U. Marder, and Y. Yom-Tov, "On the Decline of Migrant Quail (Coturnix C. Coturnix) Populations in Israel and Sinai," *Israel Journal of Zoology* 18 (1969) 317-23; A. Parmelee, *All the Birds of the Bible* (New York, 1959), esp. 73-78, 87-88; R. Pinney, *The Animals in the Bible* (Philadelphia, 1964), esp. 156-57.

1. See *HAL,* III, 1331b.
2. *LexSyr,* 476; Wehr, *Arab.Wb.*⁵, 594.

gár paramythían (NRSV "to give them relief").[3] P. Joüon associates it with Arab. *saliya* VIII, "be fat" (said of sheep) because the quail is an especially fat bird.[4]

3. *LXX.* The LXX translates *śᵉlāw* as *ortygométra,* "quail mother" (so also Wis. 16:2; 19:12), which according to the lexicographers Hesychius of Alexandria and Photius refers to an especially large variety of quail.

II. Zoological Considerations. The European quail *(coturnix communis),* ranging from Spain to Siberia, is a migratory bird that during the autumn flies along various routes to the south, especially to northern Africa. Some winter in southern Europe, other populations cross the eastern Mediterranean and then fly over the Sinai Peninsula from Gaza to Port Said, whence they then expand their flight southward to the Sudan, returning along the same route in the spring. Because the birds are exhausted from their long flight over the Mediterranean, and because they fly quite low, they are usually easy to catch, something Diodorus Siculus and Josephus already mention.[5] From the end of the 19th century to the beginning of World War II, hundreds of thousands of quail were captured in nets each autumn all along the Sinai coast and exported to gourmet restaurants in Europe.

III. OT Quail Narratives.

1. *Ex. 16.* In Ex. 16:13 (P) a returning swarm of quail encounters the departing Israelites somewhere on the Sinai Peninsula during the spring. Because the birds do travel at night, they appear here quite correctly during the evening. In contrast to the manna (and differently than the announcement in vv. 8,12 leads one to expect), this gift of the quail occurs but once. All remaining references to the manna and quail depend on Ex. 16 (P with various additions).[6]

2. *Nu. 11.* a. *Basic Narrative.* Although Ex. 16 makes only peripheral reference to the beneficent gift of quail granted to the complaining Israelites before the events at Sinai (cf. Wis. 16:2), in Nu. 11:4-6,10-13,18-24a,31-34 an author probably associated with P[7] expanded the story into one in which after the powerful events at Sinai the people, still complaining and dissatisfied with the manna, are punished with what for desert travelers was an unusual, month-long diet of meat. The author associates the complaint narrative with the traditional wilderness station *qiḇrôṯ hatta'ᵃwâ,* providing thus a plausible explanation for the place name.

This time the quails come in from the sea (v. 31; similarly Wis. 19:12; by contrast, Ps. 78:26-27 has the east and south winds bring in the "winged birds"), which corre-

---

3. *Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 35 (1889) 190.

4. "Notes de lexicographie Hébraïque," *MUSJ* 6 (1913) 163-64. Cf. Bab. *Yoma* 75b; and *AuS,* I, 168.

5. Diodorus, *World History* 1.60; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.1.5.

6. → מָן *mān,* VIII, 393-95; cf. Maiberger, 223-33, 318-20, 428-30.

7. Cf. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 83, who suggests the author was associated with J.

sponds perfectly with the actual situation in the autumn. The remark that the wind brought the quails into the camp (Tg. Ps.-Jon. and Vg. add "and flew"), piling them up "about two cubits deep on the ground," however, derives from theological reflection and symbolic hyperbole that are consciously creating a conspicuous contrast with the thin layer of manna (Ex. 16:14). Whereas the manna was able to nourish the Israelites daily during their entire forty years of wilderness wanderings (Ex. 16:35), the quail meat brought them only a plague and death even though they were walking around hip-deep in the birds and each person was able to gather not merely an *ʿōmer,* as with the manna (Ex. 16:16), but rather a thousandfold, namely, ten *ḥōmer* (v. 32).

b. *Spiritualized Expansion.* A later author "from circles of ecstatic 'prophecy'"[8] added an inspirational narrative to the quail episode (Nu. 11:14-17,24b-30), presumably to lend a spiritualized interpretation to the narrative of the gift of quail (similarly also with the manna in Ex. 16:16-20,32-34; Dt. 8:2-4). H. Seebass takes a different position, suggesting that, in a reverse fashion, the basic narrative of the engagement of the seventy elders derives from J and has been augmented by the pre-Dtr quail narrative in vv. 4bβ,10a,12-13,18aα,19-20a,21-23a,24a,31-33a.[9]

The keyword in this spiritualization is probably the *rûaḥ* (v. 31, "wind") that brings in the divine gift and is interpreted as "spirit." It is questionable, however, whether the quail ever functioned as a symbol of the spirit as did the dove in the NT.[10]

Maiberger†

---

8. So ibid., 89.
9. "Num. XI, XII und die Hypothese des Jahwisten," *VT* 28 (1978) 214-23.
10. So O. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse* (Leipzig, 1922), 41.

שְׂמֹאל *śᵉmōʾl;* *הִשְׂמִיל *hiśmîl;* שְׂמָאלִי *śᵉmāʾlî*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. OT: 1. Direction; 2. Left-Handed Persons; 3. Unlucky Side. III. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

śᵉmōʾl. K. Aartun, "Notizen zur hebräischen Nominalmorphologie," *BiOr* 31 (1974) 38-39; J. Cuillandre, *La droite et la gauche dans les poèmes homériques* (Paris, 1944); A. Gornatowski, "Rechts und Links im antiken Aberglauben" (diss., Breslau, 1936); R. Grieshammer, "Rechts und Links," *LexÄg,* V, 191-93; P. Hajdu, "Die Benennung der Begriffe rechts und links als Ausdruck der Beziehung zwischen Sprache und Denken," *Acta Linguistica,* I (Budapest, 1951) 171-248; B. Hartmann, "Rechts und Links," *BHHW,* III, 1564-65; R. Needham, ed., *Right and Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Claassification* (Chicago, 1973); O. Nussbaum, "Die Bewertung von rechts und links in der römischen Liturgie," *JAC* 5 (1962) 158-71; E. Qimron, "The Names of the Directions in Our Ancient Sources," *BethM* 25 (1979) 41-47; A. Rett, T. Kohlmann, and G. Strauch, *Linkshänder* (Vienna, 1973); L. Röhrich, "Links und rechts," *RGG²,* IV, 382; K. Tallqvist, *Himmelsgegenden und Winde. Eine semasiologische Studie. StOr* 2 (1928), 105-85, esp. 123ff.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Parallels to Heb. *śᵉmōʾl* are widespread and include the unusual Akkadian construction *šumē/īlu(m),* "left side, left hand,"[1] a primary noun; also Old Can. *sim(ḫ)al* in the Mari texts;[2] Ugar. *šmʾl,* "the left hand";[3] Old Aram. *šmʾl,*[4] probably "left region" or "northern land" (as the name of a region = Akk. *ᵘʳᵘsa-ma-al-la* and similar[5]); Syr. *semmālāʾ,* "the left hand"[6] (deriving from **simʾālāʾ* with secondary doubling of the *m*); Mand. *smal(a),* "left, to the left";[7] Palmyr. *šml* alongside *sml,* also with the suf. *ʿal š/smlk,* "to your left."[8]

Reference to Eth. *ḍagām,* "left, crooked, bent," mentioned by Dillmann and going back to H. Ewald,[9] cannot be used because Ewald's postulated equivalents (*ś* — *ḍ* and *ʾ* — *g* with transposition) are too far-fetched. Moreover, W. Leslau has in the meantime classified Eth. *ḍagama* etymologically.[10]

Alongside Arab. *šimāl,* "left side, left hand, left, north," and *šamāl,* "north wind," reference is also made to *aš-Šām,* "Syria" (region of the north from the perspective of the Kaaba as opposed to Yemen, region of the south). Strikingly, one also encounters the OSA root *šʾml* alongside *šʾm,* specifically *šʾml* as a verb in the H stem,[11] "be northward?" (cf. also *ymn/wšʾml,* "to the right and to the left"[12]), *šʾmt* as the subst. "north": as the vb. *šʾm,* "march northward," and as the adj. *šʾmyt,* "northward."[13] The term *šml* in the fragmentary and ill-copied inscription *CIH* 462.5 should not be adduced in connection with *šmʾl.*[14] Minaean attests the forms *šʾml* in the expression *dy/šʾml,* "the two from the north," and *šʾmt,* "the north."[15] Qatabanian also attests the plural of the *nisbe* form as *ʾymnn/wʾšmn,* "those of the south and those of the north."[16]

Given the juxtaposition of Arab. *šimāl* and *šām* and OSA *šʾml* and *šʾm,* scholars understandably viewed Heb. *śᵉmōʾl* as a triconsonantal word from the root *śʾm* or *śmʾ* with the appended ending *-l* (cf. *šᵉʾôl*) or *al* (dissimilated from the locative ending *-an* to *-al,* progressive dissimilation from *n* to *l* in contact with *m*).[17] Scholars also considered

1. *AHw,* III, 1271.
2. See *ABLAK,* 2:250-51.
3. *WUS,* 2622; *KTU* 1.23, 64 and 1.2, I, 40.
4. *KAI* 202A.7; 216.2/3; 217.1.
5. Cf. S. Parpola, *Neo-Assyrian Toponyms. AOAT* 6 (1970), 301.
6. *LexSyr,* 481.
7. *MdD,* 332.
8. *DNSI,* II, 1162.
9. *LexLingAeth,* 1336; H. Ewald, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes* (Göttingen, ⁷1863), 279.
10. *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 149.
11. *CIH,* 432.6.
12. C. Robin, "Documents de l'Arabie antique II," *Raydān* 4 (1981) 54.
13. *HAL,* III, 1332b, reads *šʾmt* incorrectly as *śʾmt* and *šʾmyt* incorrectly as *śʾmyt;* cf. Biella, 509-10; Beeston, 130.
14. Despite A. F. L. Beeston, "On the Correspondence of Hebrew *s* to ESA *s²*," *JSS* 22 (1977) 56; and *HAL,* III, 1332b.
15. *RES,* 3026; 302, 2, 13; cf. *TUAT,* I/6, 665.
16. *RES,* 4328, 4-5.
17. Concerning the dissimilation, cf. R. Ružîčka, *Konsonantische Dissimilation in den semitischen Sprachen. Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* VI/4

whether *śᵉmō'l* might be an amalgamation of *ś'm* and *mûl,* or whether the root *śml,* "swaddle, wrap," might have served as an etymon for *śᵉmō'l* because one was accustomed to throwing one's cloak or mantle, *śimlâ,* over one's left shoulder before wrapping oneself in it.[18] P. de Lagarde is doubtless correct in viewing Heb. *śᵉmō'l* and Arab. *šam'al* as an "ancient word" whose structure cannot be unraveled any further.[19] What one finds, then, is that the etymological derivation of the word *śᵉmō'l* is disputed.

2. *Occurrences.* The term *śᵉmō'l* occurs 54 times in the OT, including 27 times spelled plene (with *waw*) as *śᵉmō'wl.* The sequence *yāmîn-ûśᵉmō'l* occurs 37 times; the left hand, *yaḏ śᵉmō'l,* occurs only in Jgs. 3:21; 7:20; Ezk. 39:3. The denominated verb in the hiphil occurs 5 times (Gen. 13:9; 2 S. 14:19; 1 Ch. 12:2; Isa. 30:21; Ezk. 21:21[Eng. 16]) meaning "turn to the left" (4 times) or "use the left hand" (1 Ch. 12:2). In the hiphil *śm'l* always parallels the hiphil of *ymn,* "turn to the right." Defective orthography (without the *aleph*) occurs as the fem. sg. impv. *haśmîlî* in Ezk. 21:21(16) for **haśmᵉ'îlî* and as the inf. *lᵉhaśmîl* in 2 S. 14:19 for **lᵉhaśmᵉ'îl.* The masculine plural participle is pointed as *maśmi'lîm* in 1 Ch. 12:2 instead of as **maśmᵉ'ilîm.* The adj. *śᵉmā'lî,* with *nisbe î,* occurs 9 times, including 6 as feminine with the article *haśśᵉmā'lîṯ.*

II. OT.

1. *Direction.* Right and left also refer to directions. Ezk. 1:10 describes the four faces of the cherubim with a division to the left and to the right. By contrast, Job 23:8-9 uses the compass sequence east *(qeḏem),* west *('āḥôr),* north *(śᵉmō'wl),* south *(yāmîn)* when Job is asked where he can find God. Looking east, the left lies to the north; cf. "Hobah, north of Damascus" (Gen. 14:15) and the boundary description of the territory of Asher, where the boundary "continues in the north to Cabul" (Josh. 19:27).

If one's perspective changes, the meaning of the directions can also shift. T. Nöldeke points out that in Hadramaut, *šimāl* does not, as is usually the case in Arabic, mean "left, north," but rather "southwest," since it is the qibla that determines the direction of one's face.[20] Facing east, the north side is also the left side (cf. Ezk. 16:46: "Your [Jerusalem's] elder sister is Samaria, who lived with her daughters to the left [i.e., north] of you; and your younger sister, who lived to the right [i.e., south] of you, is Sodom with her daughters"). Ezk. 4:4 also refers to the northern kingdom when Ezekiel is told to lie on his side without moving, as if bound with cords, for one hundred ninety days, symbolically bearing Israel's punishment.

The terms *yāmîn* and *śᵉmō'l* are used together to indicate direction when an author is emphasizing that one should deviate neither to the right nor to the left; the intention is quite concrete in reference to the path already taken or to be taken, and the verbs include *swr* (Dt. 2:27; 1 S. 6:12, where the cows towing the cart with the ark "go straight

---

(Leipzig/Baltimore, 1909), 104; in general cf. *VG,* I, 394; E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräische Sprache,* II/1 (Leipzig, 1895), 143.

18. *GesTh,* III, 1332.

19. *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 35 (Göttingen, 1889) 116.

20. *NBSS,* 82, following information from Graf Landberg.

in the direction of Beth-shemesh along one highway, lowing as they went; they turned neither to the right nor to the left") and *nāṭâ* (Nu. 20:17; 22:26; 2 S. 2:19,21). The expression is also used metaphorically, for example, in reference to a judge's decision (Dt. 17:11) and especially in reference to keeping the law (Dt. 5:32; 17:20; 28:14; Josh. 1:7; 23:6; 2 K. 22:2 par. 2 Ch. 34:2 [variously with the vb. *swr*]; cf. also Isa. 30:21, "This is the way; walk in it even if you yourself wanted to go to the right or to the left"). The words of the Maccabee Mattathias can be adduced in this context: "We will not obey the king's words by turning aside from our religion to the right hand or to the left" (1 Mc. 2:22).

2. *Left-Handed Persons.* Being left-handed was often perceived as a sign of clumsiness. Judging from the form of prehistoric tools and the witness of ancient traditions, left-handed persons have always been in the minority. For example, Plato laments the one-sided education that tends to make people right-handed.[21] That antiquity basically acknowledged the dominant significance of being right-handed also emerges from the Greek designation for those who were ambidextrous, *amphidéxios* and *amphoterodéxios,* betraying the notion that in a way, the ambidextrous person actually had two right hands (cf. the LXX rendering of *ʾiṭṭēr yaḏ yᵉmînô* in Jgs. 3:15 and 20:16 as *amphoterodéxios*). Left-handers appear in the OT only as members of the tribe bearing the word *yāmîn,* "right," in the name itself, namely, Benjamin. It is in this context that the adj. *ʾiṭṭēr* occurs, probably meaning "inhibited, lame," specifically *yaḏ-yᵉmînô,* "in the right hand," i.e., left-handed (Jgs. 3:15; 20:16). The Benjaminite Ehud assassinates the Moabite king Eglon. As a left-hander, he is able to hide his sword on his right so that he is admitted to the presence of the king as an unarmed tributary and is able to kill Eglon in a surprise attack (Jgs. 3:12-20). Joab kills the military commander Amasa in a similar fashion in 2 S. 20:9-10 by grabbing him by the beard with his right hand and holding him so tightly that he is able to draw his sword with his left hand and plunge it into Amasa's belly. This motif of the left-handed Benjaminites is wondrously expanded to include seven hundred left-handed Benjaminites (Jgs. 20:16) each of whom "could sling a stone at a hair, and not miss." 1 Ch. 12:2 is more realistic in recounting that David's Benjaminite warriors could "shoot arrows and sling stones with either the right hand or the left"; their numbers were so small, however, that they could be mentioned by name.

3. *Unlucky Side.* Biblical texts, albeit rarely, share the negative estimation of the left side attested in many cultures. Jacob (Israel) blesses the two sons of Joseph, Manasseh and Ephraim, by crossing his hands, laying his right hand on Ephraim's head even though he was the younger and his left hand on Manasseh's head even though he was the firstborn. The younger son thus receives the greater blessing; the elder, though historically less significant, son is blessed only with the less powerful left hand (Gen. 48:13-14). According to Eccl. 10:2, the fool chooses the way of the left, i.e., the incor-

---

21. *Nomoi* 7.794d ff.

rect way, and thus becomes a sinner. In an addendum to Prov. 4:27, the LXX explicitly identifies the path to the left as the perverted one *(diestramménai).* Mt. 25:33, according to which those condemned at judgment will stand to the left, shows that the left side was viewed as the unlucky side. The alteration of Josh. 23:6 in LXX^A is also interesting in this respect, changing "turning aside from it [Yahweh's law] neither to the right nor to the left" to "so that you do not pervert the right into the left." Jon. 4:11 either is referring to children as such who are unable to distinguish the right from the left, or is addressing Nineveh's residents as such because they know only natural revelation rather than Yahweh's law.

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates *śᵉmōʾl* 51 times as *aristerós* and 16 times as *euṓnymos.* In only one passage, 1 K. 7:21 (LXX 7:7), does the LXX call the pillar to the right (Jachin) and the pillar to the left (Boaz) simply "the one" and "the other (second)." In Josh. 19:27 LXX^B transcribes as *masomel,* and in Neh. 8:4 LXX^A exchanges *ex aristerṓn* for *ex euōnýmōn* (cf. 3 Ezra 9:44). The term *euṓnymos,* "of good name, good reputation, famous, left," seems to represent a euphemistic substitution for the earlier designations for left *skaiós* and *laiós.* The term *aristerós* is actually the comparative of *áristos,* so that *áristos* is to be understood not as the superlative but as the positive degree, so that *aristerós* actually means "better" and thus represents either a euphemism such as *euṓnymos* or an indication that the left side was originally understood as being the lucky side.

In the Vg. Jerome consistently (56 times) translates *śᵉmōʾl* as *sinister,* and only 8 times (Gen. 14:15; Ex. 14:22; Josh. 19:27; Jgs. 16:29; 2 Ch. 3:17; Cant. 2:6; 8:3; Isa. 54:3) as the subst. *laeva* or *leva.* The Vg. abbreviates Lev. 14:16,27 (though cf. vv. 17,29), interprets 1 Ch. 12:2 as "two-handed slingers," and in 1 K. 7:21 (see discussion of LXX above) uses *secunda.*

2. *Qumran.* The term *šmʾwl* occurs 15 times in the Hebrew texts from Qumran (1QS 1:15; 3:10; 7:15; 1QM 6:8; 8:5; 9:14; 4QDibHam^a 1-2, II, 14; 4QM^a 1-3, 14; 11QT 13:5; 44:5; 45:3; 56:8; 4Q266 3, X, 18; 376 1, II, 1,2) and 7 times in the Aramaic texts (1QapGen 21:8; 22:10; 5Q15 1, I, 4,12; II, 2; 1QʿAmram 5:13; and 4Q76 3).[22] Generally *šmʾwl* refers to the left side or to north as a direction. Only one passage specifically mentions the left hand. Among the punishments regarding deportment and the behavior of the sect members toward one another, 1QS 7:15 says that "whoever has drawn out his left hand to gesticulate with it *(lśwḥ bh)* shall do penance for ten days." This relatively minor offense seems to be punished here with undue severity. The punishment is presumably less for reproaching a speaker than for the prohibited use of the left hand for superstitious reasons.[23]

Kellermann†

---

22. Beyer, 213, 254.

23. See A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Eng. trans., Gloucester, 1973), 89.

שָׂמַח śāmaḥ; שָׂמֵחַ śāmēaḥ; שִׂמְחָה śimḥāh

Contents: I. 1. Occurrences; 2. Early Versions; 3. Etymology. II. 1. Expressions; 2. Word Field: a. Synonyms; b. Antonyms; 3. Meaning: a. Basic Considerations; b. Expression, Occasion, Assessment; c. Secular Contexts; d. Theological Contexts; e. Theological Use; f. Ecclesiastes. III. 1. Sirach; 2. Qumran.

I. 1. *Occurrences.* With the exception of Joshua, Haggai, Malachi, Ruth, and Daniel, the root *śmḥ* occurs in all the OT books, though with regard to text length[1] it occurs most frequently in Ecclesiastes (17 times), also (with decreasingly proportionate frequency) in Proverbs (28 times), Psalms (68), Esther (10), Nehemiah (9), and Isaiah (25); the occurrences in Deuteronomy (12) correspond to the average.[2] The root *śmḥ* occurs 129 times in the qal (including Eccl. 2:10, which can also be classified as an adj.), 28 in the piel, and once in the hiphil (Ps. 89:43[Eng. 42]); the subst. *śimḥāh* occurs 97 times and the verbal adj. *śāmēaḥ* 20 times. In 2 K. 20:13 *śmḥ* qal should be conjectured following LXX, Pesh., Vg., and Isa. 39:2.[3] The Aramaic equivalent to *śmḥ* is attested in Biblical Aramaic as the subst. *ḥeḏwâ* (Ezra 6:16), the Hebrew alongside *ḥeḏwâ* (Neh. 8:10; 1 Ch. 16:27), *ḥdh* qal (Ex. 18:9; Job 3:6) and piel (Ps. 21:7[6]).[4]

śāmaḥ. J. B. Bauer, "Ad Deum qui laetificat iuventutem meam," *VD* 40 (1962) 184-89; G. Braulik, "Die Freude des Festes. Das Kultverständnis des Deuteronomium — die älteste biblische Festtheorie," *Leiturgia Koinonia-Diakonia. FS Kardinal F. König* (Vienna, 1970), 127-79 = *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums. SBAB* 2 (1988), 161-218; M. Fraenkel, "Zur Etymologie von *śamaḥ*, 'sich freuen,'" *WZ Halle* 12 (1963) 1048-49; J. C. Greenfield, "Lexicographical Notes II," *HUCA* 30 (1959) 141-51; D. Grossberg, "The Dual Glow/Grow Motif," *Bibl* 67 (1986) 547-54; V. Hamp, "Die Wurzel שָׂמַח im AT," *WZ Halle* 10 (1961) 1333-34; D. W. Harvey, "Rejoice not, O Israel!" *Israel's Prophetic Heritage. FS J. Muilenburg* (New York, 1962), 116-27; P. Humbert, "*Laetari et exultare* dans le vocabulaire religieux de l'AT (Essai d'analyse des termes *sāmaḥ* et *gīl*)," *RHPR* 22 (1942) 185-214 = *Opuscules d'un hébraïsant* (Neuchâtel, 1958), 119-45; H. Lenowitz, "The Mock-*śimḥâ* of Psalm 137," in E. R. Follis, ed., *Directions in Biblical Hebrew Poetry. JSOTSup* 40 (1987), 149-59; G. Mansfeld, "Der Ruf zur Freude im AT" (diss., Heidelberg, 1965); F. Matheus, *Singt dem Herrn ein neues Lied. Die Hymnen Deuterojesajas. SBS* 141 (1990); O. Michel, "Freude," *RAC,* VIII (1972), 348-418; E. Otto and T. Schramm, *Festival and Joy. Bibical Encounter Series* (Eng. trans., Nashville, 1980); E. Ruprecht, "שׂמח *śmḥ* to rejoice," *TLOT,* III, 1272-77; G. Vanoni, "Das Problem der Homonymie beim althebräischen *'LZ/'LṢ*," *BN* 33 (1986) 29-33; C. Westermann, *Roots of Wisdom: The Oldest Proverbs of Israel and Other Peoples* (Eng. trans., Louisville, 1995).

1. Cf. *TLOT,* III, 1444-45, table 3.
2. Contra Braulik, 180.
3. A different view is taken by D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT. OBO* 50/1 (1982), 416.
4. Arguments against a conjecture in Jer. 31:13 can be found in D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT. OBO* 50/2 (1986), 686-87. Cf. Wagner, 51-52 (nos. 83-87).

2. *Early Versions.* The Tgs. and Pesh. translate *śmḥ* almost without exception with the root *ḥdʾ/ḥdy,* and only in isolated instances with *bdḥ, byʿ, bsm, dwṣ, rwz, śmḥ.* The translation of *śmḥ* in the LXX and Vg. is fairly consistent: LXX *euphrain-* and its derivatives (218 times), *chair-* (35), *agall-* (2), *gel-* (2), *terp-* (1), *u[y]mn-* (1); Vg. *laet-* and its derivatives (207), *gaud-* (36), *epul-* (9), *delect-* (4), *-sult-* (4), *hilar-* (1), *volupt-* (1). Renderings not bearing the semantic element of "joy" (4 times in the LXX, 3 each in the Pesh. and Vg.) are of no account and by no means indicate the presence of homonyms.[5]

3. *Etymology.* Apart from Hebrew, terms corresponding to the root *śmḥ* as an expression of joy occur in other Semitic languages as well, including Ammonite *śmḥ,* "be glad" (inscription from Tell Siran), Amorite PNs such as *Simḫi-Dagan,* Can. *šmḫ,* "gladden," Ugar. *šmḫ,* "be glad," *šmḫt,* "joy," and Pun. *šmḥ,* "be glad," *šm(y)ḥt,* "joy."[6]

Ever since F. Perles's suggestion that one associate Isa. 9:16(17) with Arab. *samuḥa,* "be kind," the search for homonyms to *śmḥ* in other Semitic languages has not ceased.[7] More passages are affected than Ruprecht assumes.[8] Recurrent suggestions include Akk. *šamāḫu,* "grow, flourish," Arab. *šamaḫa,* "be high, proud," Ugar. *šmḫ,* "radiate, shine," Aram./Syr. *ṣmḥ,* "shine, grow luxuriantly," and Heb. *ṣmḥ,* "put forth shoots."[9]

Apart from the cj. *yišmaḥ* ("be generous") following Arab. *samuḥa* in Isa. 9:16(17) as suggested by Perles and now generally accepted,[10] I do not believe that the remaining cases under discussion need either emendations or etymological lexical entries

---

5. See I.3 below.

6. On Middle Hebrew cf. *ANH,* 411; *HAL,* III, 1333-34. On Ammonite M. Baldacci, "The Ammonite Text from Tell Siran and North-West Semitic Philology," *VT* 31 (1981) 367 (with bibliog.), reads the hophal instead of the qal. On Amorite see *APNM,* 250; additional documentation is in *HAL,* III, 1336a (bibliog.). On Canaanite see EA 109:50; questionable, cf. *HAL,* III, 1334a. On Ugaritic see *WUS,* no. 2626; *UT,* no. 2432; G. Del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaan segun la tradicion de Ugarit* (Madrid, 1981), 629-30. On Pun. *šmḥ* see *DNSI,* II, 1160; questionable, cf. M. Sznycer, *Les passages puniques en transcription latine dans le "Poenulus" de Plaute* (Paris, 1967), 116-17. On Pun. *šm(y)ḥt* see M.-J. Fuentes Estañol, *Vocabulario fenicio* (Barcelona, 1980), 237.

7. "Notes critiques sur le texte de l'Ecclésiastique," *REJ* 35 (1897) 63; "Critical Notes: Gesenius' Hebrew Dictionary," *JQR* 11 (1899) 689.

8. Ruprecht, 1273; cf. also *HAL,* III, 1333-34.

9. On Akkadian see *AHw,* III, 1153. On Ugaritic see *KTU* 1.17, II, 9. On Aramaic see *ANH,* 364; on Syriac, *LexSyr,* 305. On Hebrew cf. G. R. Driver, "Problems in the Hebrew Text of Proverbs," *Bibl* 32 (1951) 179-80; H. L. Ginsberg, "The North-Canaanite Myth of Anath and Aqhat," *BASOR* 98 (1945) 15, 72-73; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 9 (1959) 249, 276-77; J. L. Palache, *Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon* (Leiden, 1959), 71; M. Dahood, "Congruity of Metaphors," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 40-41; P. J. van Zijl, *Baal: A Study of Texts in Connexion with Baal in the Ugaritic Epics. AOAT* 10 (1972) 120-22; D. J. A. Clines, "The Tree of Knowledge," *VT* 24 (1974) 10-11; Ruprecht, 1272-73; Ringgren, צמח *ṣāmaḥ,* → XII, 410; *HAL,* III, 1333-34.

10. *LexHebAram,* 802; Ruprecht, 1273; *HAL,* IV, 1557a s.v. שׁמח (with bibliog.); thorough discussion in Barthélemy, *Critique,* 2:65-66.

from related languages. The positing of homonyms merely displaces the problems. Basically, however, the problem is not that of the meaning in any one language, but rather more generally the translation of expressions for emotions. In some cases (e.g., *ʿlz/ʿlṣ*),[11] the process of separation into several etymons begins already in the early versions; in others, such separation begins only in the discussion among Hebraists. In the case of *śāmaḥ,* however, various individual considerations suggest a semantic element of "external (violent) movement/agitation," which is hard to imagine in connection with an etymon for "be high, proud" or "shine."[12] For example, Prov. 13:9 can easily be rendered as "burns merrily."[13]

II. 1. *Expressions.* Forms of the vb. *śmḥ* referring to the imperfect aspect (40 times impf., 18 pf. consec.) are slightly in the majority over against the perfect forms (19 times pf., 23 impf. consec.). Appellative forms constitute a large proportion (14 times impv., 9 vetitive, 7 cohortative, 20 jussive). The qal infinitive construct occurs 5 times (Ps. 106:5; Eccl. 3:12; 5:18[19]; 8:15; Ezk. 35:14), the piel infinitive absolute once (Jer. 20:15), and the piel participle twice (Jgs. 9:13; Ps. 19:9). The "rejoicing" subject (subj. in the qal; obj. in the piel and hiphil) is usually animate. Inanimate subjects include the human "heart" (10 times; cf. Ps. 16:9) or "soul" (Ps. 86:4). In poetic speech inanimate subjects can imply animate inhabitants, or can be used figuratively (in personification): "earth" (Ezk. 35:14; text?), "heaven" (Ps. 96:11 par. 1 Ch. 16:31), "islands" (Ps. 97:1), "city" (46:5[4]), "mountain" (48:12[11]), "cypresses" (Isa. 14:8), "light" (Prov. 13:9). Because the subject refers to the initiator of joy in the piel, it is not surprising that a third of the occurrences use inanimate subjects and even abstract subjects: "wine" (Ps. 104:15; Eccl. 10:19), "new wine" (Jgs. 9:13), "stringed instruments" (Ps. 45:9[8]), "water" (Ps. 46:5[4]), "oil" (Prov. 27:9), "precepts" (Ps. 19:9[8]), "word" (Prov. 12:25), "light" (Prov. 15:30). Substantives and adjectives are never used figuratively; the "rejoicing" subject is always a living being or its "heart" (9 times; cf. Prov. 15:13; Jer. 15:16). Of the qal occurrences, 63 of 129 have only the subject.[14]

Other attested syntagmas include the direct object (piel: person 12 times, cf. Dt. 24:5; God and human being: Jgs. 9:13; hiphil: person: Ps. 89:43[42]) and prepositional objects indicating the object of joy (God 13 times; cf. Ps. 32:11; human being 17 times; cf. Jgs. 9:19; concrete objects such as "gifts" [Isa. 39:2], "wine" [Zech. 10:7], and "castor bean plant" [Jon. 4:6] are joined by abstractions such as *mišlāḥ* [Dt. 12:7,18]; *yᵉšûʿâ* [1 S. 2:1; Isa. 25:9]; *maʿᵃśeh* [Ps. 104:31; Eccl. 3:22]; *ʿāmāl* [Eccl. 2:10; 5:18[19]]; *ṭôḇ* [Dt. 26:11; cf. Ex. 18:9]; *ḥeseḏ* [Ps. 31:8(7)]; in Ps. 106:5, the joy of oth-

11. → XI, 117.

12. See II.2 below.

13. With C. Siegried and B. Stade, *Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1893), 755; *LexHebAram,* 802; contra *HAL,* III, 1335a, which incorrectly adduces TOB, "brillera gaiement"; Tgs., Pesh., and Vg. also translate as "joy." Concerning this entire question, see the methodological explications in Vanoni, 31-32.

14. Humbert, 121, cites only 40; he is apparently not distinguishing between fixed syntagmas and free circumstants.

ers becomes the object of one's own joy; the most frequent prep. is *bᵉ* [cf. Dt. 12:7]; both *lᵉ* and *ʿal* can indicate the object of malicious pleasure [cf. Isa. 14:8; Lam. 2:17]; *min* indicates the initiator of joy in either a positive [Prov. 5:18; Eccl. 2:10] or a negative sense [the cessation of sorrow in Jer. 31:13]; both possibilities remain open in 2 Ch. 20:27; the positive *min* needs no explanation from Ugaritic;[15] *liqraʾṯ* occurs in the pregnant construction in Jgs. 19:3 in the sense of "go toward with joy"; cf. 1 S. 18:6).[16]

The transition from fixed to free syntagmas is sometimes fluid. In Jer. 31:13 (cf. Dt. 16:14), the expression *bᵉmāḥôl* can refer either to the object or to the locus/occasion of joy; *bᵉḵol-yāmênû* in Ps. 90:14 and *bᵉṣēʾṯām* in 105:38 (cf. 118:24; 122:1) can refer either to the object or to the time/occasion of joy. In 92:5(4) *bᵉpoʿoleḵā* can refer either to the object or to the instrument of joy/gladness. In such cases comms. and lexicons are more reserved in positing free syntagmas than are translations.[17] The combination *lipnê* + divine epithet (6 times)[18] refers to the "external," *bᵉlibbô* in Ex. 4:14 to the "internal" locus of joy. Isa. 66:10 summons readers to participate (*ʾeṯ*, "with") in the joy of others. Prepositional phrases with *kᵉ* introduce points of comparison (Ps. 90:15; Isa. 9:2[3]; 30:29). The intensity of joy is expressed by *mᵉʾōḏ* (1 S. 11:15; 1 K. 5:21[7]), by infinitive absolute constructions (Jer. 20:15), or by a *figura etymologica* (always with the adj. "great": 1 K. 1:40; 1 Ch. 29:9; Neh. 12:43; Jon. 4:6). Infinitive expressions indicate the content (*lᵉ* in 1 S. 6:13; Prov. 2:14) or occasion (*bᵉ* in Dt. 33:18 [time?]; Ps. 14:7; 53:7[6]; 105:38; Prov. 24:17; 29:2 [time?]; *kᵉ* in 1 K. 5:21[7]; Jer. 41:13; *ʿal* in 1 Ch. 29:9; 2 Ch. 29:36) of joy. Such can also be expressed in a separate clause (independent clause in Ex. 4:14; Jgs. 19:3; 1 S. 6:13; 11:9; 19:5; 2 S. 1:20; 2 K. 11:20; Ps. 69:33[32]; 85:7[6]; 97:8; 107:42; Hab. 1:15; Zeph. 3:14-15; Zech. 4:10; dependent clause in Dt. 33:18-19; Neh. 12:43; Job 31:25; Ps. 16:9-10; 31:8[7]; 58:11[10]; 67:5[4]; 69:33-34[32-33]; 107:30; 119:74; Isa. 14:29; Joel 2:21,23; Mic. 7:8; Zech. 2:14[10]).

J. Aro classifies *śmḥ* as a "verb of the class *e-a* describing a state."[19] Considering its frequent combination with prepositional objects, however, this verb of "moving emotion" is better classified as a verb of action.[20] E. Jenni describes the opposition between the piel and hiphil as that between "make" and "let," albeit while classifying *śmḥ* among the "more difficult cases."[21] S. A. Ryder finds no distinction between the piel and hiphil of *śmḥ*.[22]

Even at the level of combinations and expressions, one already notices that about 180 (two-thirds!) of all occurrences of the root *śmḥ* are found in theological contexts.

---

15. Contra M. Dahood, "Qohelet and Northwest Semitic Philology," *Bibl* 43 (1962) 351-52; cf. Ruprecht, 1274.

16. See also *LexHebAram*, 802.

17. Cf. *BDB*, 970; *LexHebAram*, 802.

18. See II.3.d below.

19. *Die Vokalisierung des Grundstammes im semitischen Verbum. StOr* 31 (1964), 117-18; a more detailed analysis in Meyer, §68.1.

20. Cf. W. Richter, *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik. ATS* 8 (1978), 95-96.

21. *HP*, 34, 98, 110-11.

22. *The D-stem in Western Semitic. Janua Linguarum. Series Practica* 131 (The Hague, 1974), 102.

Of these occurrences, about 40 are found in theological contexts in the narrower sense in that they contain direct statements about God.[23]

2. *Word Field.* a. *Synonyms.* The following synonymous roots are found either parallel to *śmḥ* or in the immediate context: *gyl* (1 Ch. 16:31; Job 3:22; Ps. 14:7; 16:9; 21:2[1]; 31:8[7]; 32:11; 43:4; 45:16[15]; 48:12[11]; 51:10[8]; 53:7[6]; 96:11; 97:1,8; 118:24; 149:2; Prov. 2:14; 23:24,25; 24:17; Cant. 1:4; Isa. 9:2[3]; 16:10; 25:9; 29:19; 66:10; Jer. 48:33; Hos. 9:1; Joel 1:16; 2:21,23; Hab. 1:15; Zeph. 3:17; Zech. 10:7), *rnn* (1 Ch. 16:31-33; Job 20:5; Ps. 5:12[11]; 32:11; 35:27; 67:5[4]; 90:14; 92:5[4]; 96:11-12; 100:2; 126:2-3; Prov. 29:6; Isa. 14:7-8; 16:10; 35:10; 51:11; 55:12; 61:7; 65:13-14; Jer. 31:7,12-13; Zeph. 3:14,17; Zech. 2:14[10]), *'lz* (2 S. 1:20; Ps. 68:4-5[3-4]; 96:11-12; Prov. 23:15-15; Isa. 24:7-8; Jer. 15:16-17; 50:11; Zeph. 3:14), *'ls* (1 S. 2:1; 1 Ch. 16:31-32; Ps. 5:12[11]; 9:3[2]; 68:4[3]), *śyś* (Est. 8:16,17; Job 3:22; Ps. 40:17[16]; 45:8-9[7-8]; 51:10[8]; 68:4[3]; 70:5; Isa. 22:13; 24:7-8,11; 35:10; 51:3,11; 66:10; Jer. 7:34; 15:16; 16:9; 25:10; 31:13; 33:11; Lam. 4:21; Zeph. 3:17; Zech. 8:19), *rw'* hiphil (2 Ch. 15:14-15; Ezra 3:11-12; Ps. 100:1-2; Isa. 16:10; Jer. 20:15-16; Zeph. 3:14), *psḥ* (Isa. 14:7-8; 55:12), *r'm* (1 Ch. 16:31-32; Ps. 96:11), *ṣhl* (Est. 8:15; Jer. 31:7; 50:11), *śḥq* (1 S. 18:6-7; Ps. 126:2-3; Prov. 14:13; Eccl. 2:2; 7:3-4; 10:19; Jer. 15:16-17). These roots all refer more or less to articulated "expressions of joy."

Other roots in the immediate context of *śmḥ* refer to clearly articulated "expressions of joy" (declamation, singing): *qôl* (1 K. 1:40,45; 1 Ch. 15:16; 2 Ch. 15:14-15; Ezra 3:12,13; Job 21:12; Isa. 51:3; Jer. 7:34; 16:9; 25:10; 33:11),[24] *šyr* (Gen. 31:27; 1 Ch. 15:16; 16:9-10; 2 Ch. 23:13,18; 29:28-30; Neh. 12:27; Ps. 68:4-5[3-4]; 69:31-33[30-32]; 104:33-34; 105:2-3; 137:3; 149:1-2; Isa. 24:7-9; 30:29), *zmr* (1 Ch. 16:9-10; Ps. 9:3[2]; 30:12-13[11-12]; 68:4-5[3-4]; 104:33-34; 105:2-3; 149:2-3; Isa. 51:3), *hll* (1 Ch. 16:10; 2 Ch. 23:13; 29:30; 30:21; Ezra 3:11-12; Ps. 34:3[2]; 63:12[11]; 64:11[10]; 69:31-33[30-32]; 104:34-35; 105:3; 106:5; 107:30-32; 109:28-30; 113:9; 149:1-2; Jer. 31:7), *ydh* hiphil (1 Ch. 16:8-10; 2 Ch. 29:30-31; Neh. 12:17; Ps. 9:2-3[1-2]; 30:12-13[11-12]; 43:4; 67:4-5[3-4] 69:31-33[30-32]; 97:12; 100:2-4; 105:1-3; 107:30-31; 109:28-30; Isa. 51:3; Jer. 33:11), *spr* (Ps. 9:2-3[1-2]). In certain contexts joy finds expression and accompaniment through "dance" and "music": *kinnôr* (Gen. 31:27; 1 Ch. 15:16; 2 Ch. 20:27-28; Neh. 12:27; Job 21:12; Ps. 43:4; 92:4[3]; 137:2-3; 149:2-3; Isa. 16:10-11; 24:7-8), *tōp̱* (Gen. 31:27; 1 S. 18:6; Job 21:12; Ps. 149:2-3; Isa. 24:7-8), *māḥôl* (1 S. 18:6; Ps. 30:12[11]; 149:2-3; Jer. 31:13), *nēḇel,* "harp" (1 Ch. 15:16; 2 Ch. 20:27-28; Neh. 12:27; Ps. 92:4-5[3-4]), *'ûgāḇ,* "flute" (Job 21:12), *ḥll,* "play the flute" (1 K. 1:40; Isa. 30:29), *šôpār* (1 K. 1:39-40; 2 Ch. 15:14-15), *ḥaṣōṣ^erâ,* "trumpets" (Nu. 10:10; 1 Ch. 15:24-25; 2 Ch. 15:14-15; 20:27-28; 29:28-30), *m^eṣiltayim,* "cymbals" (1 Ch. 15:16; Neh. 12:27), *tq'* (Nu. 10:10; 1 K. 1:39-40; 2 K.

---

23. Concerning additional observations and lists regarding combinations and expressions with *śmḥ,* cf. the lexicons, esp. *HAL* (also regarding verbal expressions using *śimḥâ*), and above all Ruprecht, and Humbert, 120-28, though Humbert finds religious or cultic contexts in only 86 cases.

24. → XII, 581-82.

11:14; 2 Ch. 23:13). Shared festival joy also includes the "meal" and "banquet": *šth* (1 K. 4:20; 1 Ch. 12:40-41[39-40]; 29:22; Neh. 8:12; Est. 5:14; 8:17; 9:17,18,19,22; Eccl. 3:12-13; 7:2-4; 9:7; Isa. 22:13; 24:7-9; 65:13; Jer. 16:8-9), *'kl* (Dt. 12:7,18; 14:26; 27:7; 1 K. 4:20; 1 Ch. 12:41[40]; 29:22; Ezra 6:21-22; Neh. 8:12; Eccl. 3:12-13; 5:18[19]; 8:15; 9:7; Isa. 22:13; 65:13; Jer. 16:8-9; Joel 1:16), *ḥgg* (Lev. 23:40-41; Dt. 16:10-11,14,15; 1 K. 8:65-66; 2 Ch. 7:9-10; 30:21; Ezra 6:22; Neh. 8:17-18; Isa. 30:29). Finally, a whole list of contexts with *lēḇ/lēḇāḇ* can be adduced showing how strongly the "heart" participates in joy, though considering the biblical understanding of the "heart" and other observations,[25] these passages have nothing to do with "internalization" (Ex. 4:14; Dt. 28:47; 1 S. 2:1; 1 K. 8:66; 1 Ch. 16:10; 29:9; 2 Ch. 7:10; 15:15; Ezra 6:22; Est. 5:9; Ps. 4:8[7]; 9:2-3[1-2]; 16:9; 32:11; 33:21; 64:11[10]; 69:33[32]; 97:11; 104:15; 105:3; Prov. 12:25; 14:10,13; 15:13,30; 17:22; 23:15; 24:17; 27:9,11; Eccl. 2:10; 5:19[20]; 7:4; 9:7; 11:9; Cant. 3:11; Isa. 24:7; 30:29; 65:13-14; Jer. 15:16; Ezk. 36:5; Zeph. 3:14; Zech. 10:7).

Verbs of perception are repeatedly found in the same context with *śmḥ*, including *r'h* (Ex. 4:14; Jgs. 19:3; 1 S. 6:13; 19:5; Job 22:19; Ps. 31:8[7]; 69:33[32]; 107:42; 119:74; Eccl. 8:15; Isa. 9:1-2[2-3]; 66:5; Jer. 41:13; Ob. 12; Zech. 4:10; 10:7) and *šm'* (1 K. 5:21[7]; Ps. 34:3[2]; 97:8; Prov. 15:30-31); here "joy" can be understood as the reaction to sensory impressions.[26]

b. *Antonyms.* Antonymous roots occurring in the same context with *śmḥ* come from the word fields for "sadness," "shame," and "fear" and include *'bl* (Est. 9:22; Ps. 35:14-15; Eccl. 7:4; Isa. 24:7; 66:10; Jer. 16:7-9; 31:13; Ezk. 7:12), *bkh* (Ezra 3:12,13; Ps. 137:1-3; Isa. 16:9-10; 22:12-13; Jer. 48:32-33), *yll* (Isa. 14:29-31; Jer. 48:31-33), *spd* (Ps. 30:12[11]; Isa. 22:12-13), *'nḥ* (Job 3:22-24; Prov. 29:2; Isa. 24:7 [in the same sentence!]; 35:10; 51:11; Joel 1:16-18), *ygh* (Est. 9:22; Isa. 35:10; 51:11; Jer. 31:13), *bwš* (Ps. 35:26; 40:15-17[14-16]; 70:3-5[2-4]; 97:7-8; 109:28; Isa. 65:13; 66:5; Jer. 50:11-12; Mic. 7:8-10), *z'q/ṣ'q* (Ps. 107:28-30; Isa. 14:29-31; 65:13-14; Jer. 20:15-16; 48:31-33; Lam. 2:17-18), *śaq* (Ps. 30:12[11]; Isa. 22:12-13), *hmh* (Isa. 16:10-11), *š'h* (Isa. 24:7-8), *yr'* (Isa. 51:11-12; Joel 2:21; Zeph. 3:14-15).

3. *Meaning.* a. *Basic Considerations.* The recurring question prompted by F. Crüsemann's study whether *śmḥ* and its synonyms can refer to "articulated speaking and singing" must take Ruprecht's findings as the point of departure, namely, that even when *śimḥā* seems best translated as "joy," its concrete expression is generally also meant, and the accompanying contexts should be examined for indications of such concrete expressions.[27] The substantival form *śimḥâ* by no means allows the conclusion that the reference is to a pure abstraction (cf. the substs. *ḥemdâ, ṭiḇḥâ, šiḇyâ*).[28]

---

25. → לב *lēḇ*, VII, 399-437; see also II.3.b below.

26. Concerning additional word fields, see II.3 below.

27. Ruprecht, 1274. Cf. Crüsemann, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel. WMANT* 32 (1969), 48, 64.

28. See *BLe*, 459, §61z'. For a basic discussion see G. Vanoni, *Literarkritik und Grammatik. Untersuchung der Wiederholungen und Spannungen in 1 Kön 11–12. ATS* 21 (1984), 156-68.

Although most lexicons do indeed enter concrete meanings for *śmḥ* and its derivatives, if "joyous feast" and "sounds of joy" are possible,[29] then why not also "song of joy"?

It is especially the advocates of the fertility-cult thesis who seem to reject any positive answer to this question; on this view a whole series of Hebrew expressions of joy are in fact not really Israelite at all, but rather are inseparably associated with the Canaanite cult.[30] If one examines the discussion in which the word "orgiastic" (whatever it may mean) exerts such considerable attraction, one discerns increasing generalization and expansion. Here Humbert originally argued primarily more with reference to *gyl* than to *śmḥ*. The thesis is already improbable not least because of psycholinguistic considerations; since it is hardly conceivable that such negatively prefigured expressions could undergo a semantic improvement within such a short time, the negative connotations are to be sought not in the individual expressions themselves but in their respective contexts, e.g., in Hos. 9:1 in the comparative *kā'ammîn*. Nonetheless, caution is certainly advisable with regard to any black-and-white commentary within religio-historical comparisons, since the texts in question are concerned primarily with criticizing Israel's own festivals rather than with any direct confrontation with other religious forms. Moreover, such cultic outbursts of joy generally represent "one of the most widely known phenomena common to religions."[31] Furthermore, the popular (17 times in Prov. 10:1–22:16 alongside once each for *'lz* and *rnn*, 9 times in 22:17–31:31 alongside *gyl* 3 times and *'lz* and *rnn* once each) and wholly positive[32] use of this root in early wisdom militates against the view that *śmḥ* was originally charged negatively.

The suspicion that the tenacious association of *śmḥ* and its synonyms with the Canaanite cult represents a *petitio principii* is confirmed by the theses of Mansfeld and Lenowitz. Athough even they do not entirely escape the danger of extrapolation, they do show that an altered heuristic perspective generates new and more plausible explanations. Lenowitz is able to show the probability of the translation "song of mirth, satirical song" for *śimḥâ*, e.g., in Ps. 137:3. The primary situation of the (originally noncultic) form is the victory celebration after a military campaign, and the contexts are in part bound to Jerusalemite traditions. Acknowledgment of the meaning "song of joy" does indeed make passages such as Ps. 51:10(8) easier to understand (*šm'* hiphil; the paraphrase "let me experience" or the cj. *śb'* hiphil are unnecessary). Scholars even prior to Lenowitz made similar observations (C. F. Keil notes regarding 1 S. 18:6 that "shout of joy" is appropriate given v. 7; cf. EÜ on 2 Ch. 23:18: "songs of joy"; Zorell: "laetitia manifestata canticis"; cf. also Neh. 12:27; Ps. 68:4[3]; 100:2; 137:3; Jer. 31:7; Zeph. 3:17; for some of these passages M. Dahood suggests the meaning "song of gladness"[33]). Mansfeld discerns the genres "jubilation" (with the form: pl. impv. ["re-

---

29. See most recently *HAL*, III, 1336.

30. Cf. esp. Humbert; Harvey; Crüsemann; also H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 153; a more reserved position is taken by J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* 24/1 (1983), 115; a critical position is taken by Mansfeld, 51; and Braulik, 175-79.

31. C. Westermann, "גִּיל *gîl* to rejoice," *TLOT*, I, 314; cf. Ruprecht, 1275; Braulik, 175-76.

32. See II.3.c below.

33. *KD*, in loc.; *LexHebAram*, 803; Dahood, *Psalms II: 51–100. AB* 17 (1968), 271.

joice"] + address ["*baṯ* + city name"] + *kî* clause; situation: arrival of the announcement of victory) and "song of welcome" (with the form: impv. ["sing"] + *kî* clause + jussive ["rejoice"]; situation: execution of the cry of jubilation at the welcome of the returning warriors) and is able to demonstrate how various theological contexts with "expressions of joy" (primarily in Deutero-Isaiah) represent adaptations of these forms. The female addressee of the imperatives that allow Crüsemann to conclude the presence of an "assurance of well-being in the context of the sexual fertility cult" in basically the same texts can then be explained by the situation of the women left behind during a time of war.[34] A similar situation applies to the exclusive participation of women in the original welcome song (cf. Ex. 15:20-21; 1 S. 18:6-7). The point of departure of the fertility-cult discussion (Hos. 9:1) can be understood as a negative allusion to a cry of jubilation (analogous to 2 S. 1:20). Alongside the studies of Lenowitz and Mansfeld, both of whom posit victory (cf. Jgs. 16:23; 1 S. 18:6) as a key situation for *śmḥ*, the studies of Otto and Matheus also undermine Crüsemann's thesis.[35]

Other observations support the semantic notion of "articulated expressions of joy." The context of *śmḥ* includes not only the roots *šyr, zmr, hll, ydh,* and *spr,*[36] all of which refer to articulated expressions, but also the vb. *'mr* (Jgs. 16:23; 1 S. 18:6-7; 1 K. 5:21[7]; Ps. 35:24-25,27; 40:17[16] par. 70:5[4] [*'mr* par. *śmḥ*]; Jer. 31:7; Am. 6:13). In Neh. 12:43 "the joy of Jerusalem was heard (*šm'* niphal) far away"; this concluding statement to the section probably also includes the songs of the "singers" in v. 42 in this "joy." Finally, the passages alluding to "malicious pleasure" also suggest a reference to articulated expression (Job 31:29; Ps. 35:15,19,24,26; 38:17[16]; Prov. 17:5; 24:17; Isa. 14:8; Jer. 50:11; Lam. 4:21; Ezk. 25:6; 35:14,15; 36:5; Ob. 12; Mic. 7:8).

b. *Expression, Occasion, Assessment.* The examination of the word field confirms that the semantic notion of "external (vehement) movement" inheres in *śmḥ*. Joy expresses itself in frisking about (Jer. 50:11), clapping (Ezk. 25:6), dancing, shouting, and singing. One of the most popular places of joy is the festival. The occasions of joy are as varied as life itself and include farewell (Gen. 31:27), meeting again (Ex. 4:14; Jgs. 19:3), good news (1 S. 11:9; 2 S. 1:20; Jer. 20:15), victory (2 S. 1:20), the welcome of a victory (1 S. 18:6), the arrival of auxiliary troops (Jer. 41:13), weddings (Cant. 3:11; Jer. 7:34; 16:9; 25:10; 33:11), the harvest (*qṣr,* Isa. 9:2[3]; 16:9-10; cf. Jer. 48:33), coronations (1 S. 11:15; 1 K. 1:40,45; 2 K. 11:14,20; 1 Ch. 12:41[40]; 2 Ch. 23:13,21), pilgrimages (Ps. 122:1; Isa. 30:29), gifts (Isa. 39:2), success (Eccl. 3:22), and shade (Jon. 4:6).[37]

If a context contains no negative entries for *śmḥ,* the assumption must be that the root carries a positive connotation, as shown precisely by those passages that speak about the cessation or absence of "joy," especially prophetic oracles of judgment (Isa. 16:10; 24:7,11; Jer. 7:34; 16:9; 25:10 [positive in Jer. 33:11]; 48:33; Ezk. 7:12; Joel 1:16). No absolute negation of "joy" is attested. Warnings are issued against overly

34. Crüsemann, 48.
35. Cf. Otto, esp. 59-60; Matheus, 35-36; also → II, 473-74.
36. See II.2.a above.
37. On malicious pleasure see II.3.a above; on religious festivals see II.3.d below.

self-confident joy and against joy at inappropriate times (Isa. 14:29; 22:13; Jer. 50:11; Lam. 4:21; Am. 6:13). Similarly, joy at one's own success or at the misfortune of one's adversaries is discouraged (2 S. 1:20), rejected (Job 31:25,29; Ps. 35:15,19,24,26 [contrasting v. 27]; 38:17[16]; Prov. 24:17; Ob. 12; Mic. 7:8), prevented or punished by God (Ps. 30:2[1]; Prov. 17:5; Ezk. 25:6; 35:15; 36:5), or even allowed by God as a temptation of the believer (Ps. 89:43[42]; Lam. 2:17; Hab. 1:15). Joy at the defeat of one's enemy, however, is not censured negatively (2 Ch. 20:27; Job 22:19; Ps. 9:3-4[2-3]; 58:11[10]; 109:28; Isa. 14:8). Joy in what is evil (Prov. 2:14) or in wicked activities (*znh* + *mēʿal,* Hos. 9:1) is rejected.

c. *Secular Contexts.* Apart from wisdom literature, *śmḥ* rarely occurs in secular contexts. By the same token, however, theological contexts are rarely found in Job and Proverbs (Job 22:19; Prov. 17:5). The delimitation of theological contexts is sometimes difficult (cf. Jon. 4:6). As an expression of the joy of love between man and woman, *śmḥ* always exhibits positive connotations. Cant. 3:11 equates the "day of the wedding" and the "day of the gladness of the heart" (cf. Ps. 45:16[15]). Dt. 24:5 frees the newly married man from military service for one year so that "he shall be free at home . . . to be happy with the wife whom he has married." In Cant. 1:4 the bride and her companions place the joys of love above those of wine (cf. Prov. 5:18). Prov. 27:9 rates the value of friendship above the joy of perfume and incense. One person can give joy to another through "wisdom" (1 K. 5:21[7]; Prov. 10:1 [the first proverb of older wisdom]; 15:20; 23:15,24,25; 27:11; 29:3; negative in 17:21), an "apt answer" (15:23), or a "good word" (12:25). Joy is the fruit of patient waiting (10:28, "the expectation of the righteous [ends in] joy"[38]) and a council of peace (*šālôm,* 12:20), of justice (21:15) and righteousness (13:9; 29:6). Hosea's criticism (7:3) focuses on the kingmakers because they ruin the joy of coronation day with their wicked deeds (regicide?[39]). People rejoice in their rulers only if the latter are "righteous" or "just" (Prov. 29:2; ironically in Jgs. 9:19). Ecclesiastes' view of the people's vacillating favor (4:16) should not be read into Neh. 12:44. Commentators assume correctly that this remark about Judah's joy over its priests and Levites represents a hidden reference to the altered circumstances during the time when Nehemiah was composed. Some, however (e.g., EÜ), by translating "well disposed," displace the cause of insufficient cooperation to the people; someone who cannot rejoice in another person must not necessarily be ill-disposed toward that person.

Wisdom observation could not fail to notice that folly can also be a source of joy, albeit only for those who have no sense (Prov. 15:21), and that those who love joy (NRSV "pleasure"), wine, and oil will suffer want (21:17; by contrast, positive in 27:9). These passages belong to a series of proverbs on the topic "joy and sorrow" that view human beings in a force field between two poles, which is why countless possibilities or situations can emerge in the relationship between joy and sorrow.[40] This tension

38. So Ruprecht, 1273; NRSV: "The hope of the righteous ends in gladness."
39. See Wolff, *Hosea,* 124.
40. See Westermann, *Roots,* 11-14 (on joy and sorrow).

comes to expression in the generally polar formulations characterizing these proverbs (14:10,13; 15:13,30; 17:22).[41] A different situation is found in the book of Esther, where only 9:22 uses antonyms, whereas all other references speak only about the unbroken joy brought by help and victory, banquets and festivals (5:9,14; 8:15,16,17; 9:17,18,19). Ecclesiastes' views of joy can be understood correctly only in connection with the theological passages.[42]

d. *Theological Contexts.* From Genesis to 2 Kings, *śmḥ* rarely occurs in theological contexts (the tribal exhortation in Dt. 33:18 does not involve theological usage;[43] we may leave in abeyance the question whether the self-glorification of the vine that "cheers gods and mortals" in Jotham's parable [Jgs. 9:13] exhibits theological features). Except for 1 S. 2:1, where Hannah exults in Yahweh's *yᵉšûʿâ,* and 1 S. 19:5, where Jonathan, intervening on David's behalf, reminds Saul of his joy in Yahweh's *tᵉšûʿâ,* all the passages involve cultic contexts. Samson's capture provides the Philistines with an occasion for a festival of rejoicing in their god Dagon (Jgs. 16:23). The transport of the ark (1 S. 6:13; 2 S. 6:12), the coronation (1 S. 11:15), and the temple dedication (1 K. 8:66) all provide occasions for Israel's joyous celebration.

Alongside isolated cultic instructions in the Holiness Code (Lev. 23:40, Feast of Tabernacles) and P^{S} (Nu. 10:10, the sounding of trumpets on the "days of rejoicing"), Deuteronomy itself contains a thoroughly conceptualized "festival theory" (so Braulik). Within the legal corpus and in the unique cultic instruction in Dt. 27:7, statements about joy are always made in the form of a commandment (pf. consec.). Joy is enjoined in the law of centralization (12:7,12,18), at the presentation of tithes (14:26), the Feast of Weeks (16:11), the Feast of Tabernacles (16:14,15), and the presentation of the firstfruits (26:11). Deuteronomy consciously speaks about common "meals" (12:7,18; 14:26; 27:7) only in connection with liturgical celebrations not focused on "the fertility of the field."[44] The joy in all the "good" that Yahweh sends (*ṭôḇ,* 26:11; cf. 1 K. 8:66) and in "all that you undertake" (*mišlāḥ,* Dt. 12:7,18) is to encompass not only the entire family, including male and female slaves, but also the Levites whom centralization has made unemployed (12:12,18; 14:26ff.; 16:11,14; 26:11) and the needy groups of "aliens, orphans, and widows" (14:29; 16:11,14; 26:12). The oracle of judgment justified in 28:47-48 uses the terminology of the primary commandments (*ʿbd)* to associate indissolubly together two sides of Israelite worship: cultic "joy" and social "gladness of heart/generosity" (thus the appropriate translation of *ṭûḇ lēḇāḇ* here [differently in Isa. 65:14; cf. 1 K. 8:66], since the word field is picking up Dt. 15:7,8,10[45]). Finally, it should be noted that a majority of these passages (Lev. 23:40; [Nu. 10:10]; Dt. 12:[7],12,18; [14:26]; 16:11; [26:11]; 27:7; [1 S. 11:15; 2 S. 6:12; 1 K.

41. On this complex in general see ibid. (on joy and sorrow), and 75ff. (on the righteous and the wicked).

42. See II.3.f below.

43. Contra Braulik, 174; cf. H.-J. Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte. BZAW* 95 (1965), 38-39.

44. Braulik, 210.

45. Cf. Braulik, 172-73; I. Höver-Johag, → טוב *ṭôḇ,* V, 307.

8:65-66]; cf. Isa. 9:2[3]) associate *śmḥ* with the cultic formula *lipnê yhwh* or with allusions to that formula, connoting the causal justification "by Yahweh."[46]

The prophets criticize not only the cult that seduces a person away from Yahweh (Hos. 9:1)[47] and banquets at inappropriate times (Isa. 22:13), but also malicious pleasure (Ob. 12) and arrogant joy at victory (Am. 6:13). The five occurrences of *śmḥ* in Ezekiel are internally related.[48] The judgment upon Israel that means the end of rejoicing (7:12) provides an occasion for malicious joy among the nations (36:5), in Ammon (25:6) and Edom (35:15), which is then punished "to the joy of the entire land" (35:14).[49] Positive statements are in the majority over negative statements regarding the withdrawal of joy in laments (Joel 1:16) and oracles of judgment (Jer. 7:34; 16:9; 25:10). Using fixed phrases associated with oracles of judgment, Jer. 33:11 promises renewed rejoicing (similarly Zech. 8:19). The gathering together of Israel will lead to exuberant joy that will also spill over to the children (Zech. 10:7). In the "cry of jubilation" and its imitations (ironically addressed to "daughter Edom" in Lam. 4:21[50]), "daughter Zion" (Zeph. 3:14; Zech. 2:14[10]; cf. "Zion" in Isa. 51:3; 66:8; Jer. 31:6; Joel 2:23) is summoned to rejoice at the retreat of her enemies and the entry of King Yahweh (Zeph. 3:14),[51] at Yahweh's "help" (Jer. 31:7), at the "great things" he has done (Joel 2:21; cf. Ps. 126:3), his "comfort" (Isa. 51:3;[52] 66:10-13), and his "dwelling in their midst" on Zion (Zech. 2:14-15[10-11]; cf. Zeph. 3:14).

The prophets rarely look back to Israel's past. Jeremiah found joy in Yahweh's words (15:16). Judah rejoiced as "at the harvest" when rescued from the hand of the Assyrians (Isa. 9:2[3]).[53] Otherwise, the prophets are always looking to the future. Judah will rejoice at Yahweh's intervention against Assyria as it does at a holy festival (Isa. 30:29).[54] The promise in 25:9-10 prefigures the thanksgiving hymn for Yahweh's "help" (the association with the destruction of Moab is probably secondary). The joy at returning from the exile is portrayed in paradisiacal colors (35:10 [= 51:11]; 55:12; cf. Jer. 31:12-13). Isa. 55:12 *(śimḥâ* par. *šālôm)* contains a reminiscence of the welcoming of victors; because there are no women who remained at home, the mountains and trees come to welcome the warriors.[55] The hope is for "everlasting joy" (35:10; 51:11 [the

46. Cf. Vanoni, *Literarkritik,* 176-80; Braulik, 212-14.

47. See II.3.a above.

48. B. Gosse, "Ezechiel 35–36:1-15 et Ezechiel 6," *RB* 96 (1989) 511-17.

49. Concerning the translation of the difficult term *kiśmōaḥ,* cf. Gosse, 514-15; and E. König, *Historisch-comparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1897), 582-83, §401r: "durative simultaneity."

50. Concerning this whole complex, see Mansfeld.

51. See Ihromi, "Die Häufung der Verben des Jubelns in Zephanja III 14f., 16-18," *VT* 33 (1983) 106-10.

52. A "hymn" according to Matheus, 90ff.

53. Cf. H. Barth, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit. WMANT* 48 (1977), 141-77; C. Westermann, *Prophetic Oracles of Salvation in the OT* (Eng. trans., Louisville, 1991), 85-86, classifies this passage as postexilic.

54. See Barth, *Jesaja-Worte,* 92-103.

55. Mansfeld, 63.

expression "upon their heads," *'al-rō'šām,* can also have the meaning "at their head," *bᵉrō'š*[56]; 61:7; cf. the claim to ongoing joy in 1 K. 4:20).

The remaining texts reflect problems of the postexilic period. Zerubbabel's setting of the cornerstone allows one to forget the "day of small things" and rejoice (Zech. 4:10). A schism within Israel comes to light in the antithetical series from the word field of *śmḥ* in Isa. 65:13-14 and in the song of mockery of the "people who hate you" in 66:5.[57]

A majority of occurrences in the Psalms are associated with God's "help" and/or "righteousness." The "righteous person/believer" is often juxtaposed with the "wicked person/enemy" (cf. esp. 97:10-11). In psalms of lament and trust, the fall of one's enemies (5:12[11];[58] cf. 109:28) and God's renewed favor (90:14) bring everlasting joy to those who trust. The righteous rejoice in God's vengeance upon the wicked (58:11[10]), in the change of Zion's own fate (14:7; 53:7[6]; 126:3), and in God's beneficent counsel and assistance (16:9). The adversaries' malicious pleasure (35:15) prompts a plea for God's judgment and for an end of such joy (vv. 19,24; cf. 38:17[16]) by having the scoffers themselves shamed (v. 26), to the great joy of those who desire justice (v. 27).[59] The exiles are unable to sing "songs of mirth" (137:3; v. 4 equates "songs of Zion" with "songs of Yahweh"); it is difficult to determine whether vv. 5-6 refer to self-imprecation with a refusal to sing a song of Zion ("set Jerusalem above my highest joy"), to disguised praise of Zion,[60] or to a preparation for the "song of mockery" in vv. 7-9 (so Lenowitz). In the thanksgiving hymn the psalmist rejoices in God's love *(ḥeseḏ),* which manifested itself in delivery from the enemy (31:8-9[7-8]) and from maritime distress (107:30-31), and summons the humble to rejoice in God's saving actions (*yš'*, 34:3[2]; cf. v. 7[6]; 69:33[32],30[29]). The thanksgiving hymn of the community summons the "nations" to sing for joy at God's just world dominion (67:5[4]). Hymns celebrate Yahweh as the king, even those not using the root *mlk* (100:3, with *mar'îṯô;*[61] 113:5 with *yšb*). Joy is also elicited by Yahweh's victory over the "wicked" (68:2-4[1-3]: "let the righteous be joyful"),[62] by his dominion over the nations (96:11: "let the heavens be glad"),[63] by his cosmic intervention on behalf of his people (97:1,8,12: "let the many coastlands/Zion/you righteous be glad"), by his universal dominion at the end of days (100:2: "worship Yahweh with gladness" as an allusion to 2:11; the addressee is "all the earth" [v. 1]),[64] and by his aid to the weak and poor (1 S. 2:5; Ps. 68:4-6[3-5]; 113:9, where the barren woman becomes "the joyous

56. See L. Alonso-Schökel and C. Carniti, *RivB* 34 (1986) 397-99.

57. See Westermann, *Prophetic Oracles,* 246-51.

58. → XI, 119.

59. See O. Keel, *Feinde und Gottesleugner. Studien zum Image der Widersacher in den Individualpsalmen. SBM* 7 (1969), 155-59.

60. So H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), in loc.

61. See N. Lohfink, "Die Universalisierung der 'Bundesformel,'" *Theologie und Philosophie* 65 (1990) 174.

62. → XI, 119-20.

63. Ibid.

64. See Lohfink, 176-83.

mother of children").[65] This context includes passages in the royal psalms (21:2[1]: the king rejoices in God's "strength") and Zion psalms (46:5[4]: the "streams 'make glad' the city of God" [the antonyms to *śmḥ* in vv. 3-4 militate against the translation "efflorescere faciunt"[66]; 48:12[11]: "let Mt. Zion be glad" at God's righteousness).[67] The participial hymn extols the king "wrapped in light" (104:2) because he makes the plants from which wine comes "to gladden the human heart" (v. 15).

Theological contexts are found only in isolated instances in wisdom texts. Eliphaz quotes with rather confused arguments (text?) from the prayer tradition (Job 22:19; cf. Ps. 52:8[6]; 58:11[10]; 107:42). One proverb notes that "those who are glad at calamity will not go unpunished" (Prov. 17:5, divine passive).[68]

The term *śmḥ* occurs relatively frequently in theological contexts within materials deriving from and specific to Chronicles (regarding sources: 1 Ch. 15:16 [2 S. 6:12]; 16:10 [Ps. 105:3]; 16:31 [Ps. 96:11]; 2 Ch. 6:41 [Ps. 132:9,16 *rnn*]; 7:10 [1 K. 8:66]; 23:13,21 [2 K. 11:14,20]). Occasions include the temple construction and dedication (Ezra 3:12,13; 6:22), wall dedication (Neh. 12:27,43), coronation (1 Ch. 29:22), ark transport (1 Ch. 15:16), and generous donations for Yahweh (1 Ch. 29:9,17; 2 Ch. 24:10). Nor is rejoicing absent from important reforms, including those of Nehemiah (8:12, where hearing the torah leads to a festival of joy; v. 17, Feast of Tabernacles), Asa (2 Ch. 15:15), and Hezekiah (29:30,36; 30:21,23,25,26).[69] Michel suspects that a change in focus took place at the time of the temple construction from the expectation of eschatological joy to God's present actions.[70]

e. *Theological Use.* Theological use in the narrower sense (divine epithets as bound syntagmas) are found primarily in the Psalms, and generally in connection with God's "aid" and "righteousness," though often also in psalms of lament and trust. Common expressions include those with *śmḥ* piel + God as subject (11 times; Ps. 21:7[6], *ḥdy* piel) and *śmḥ* + God as prepositional object with *b^e* (15 times; this expression is probably not a shorthand way of saying "rejoice in Yahweh's act of deliverance,"[71] especially since passages using the longer form are rare: 1 S. 2:1; Ps. 21:2[1]; Isa. 25:9; cf. Ps. 31:8[7]; the Tgs. already exhibit a certain reserve about mentioning "joy in God"; cf. Jgs. 9:13; Ps. 66:6; 104:34 ["joy in God's word" or something similar]; Isa. 29:19; cf. also Pesh. on Neh. 8:10). Chronicles and certain prayers use *śmḥ* piel with reference to the past. God "made them joyful" at the Festival of Unleavened Bread (Ezra 6:22; Neh. 12:43) and by giving them victory over their enemies (2 Ch. 20:27); he allowed Israel's own enemies to exult (Lam. 2:17; hiphil in Ps. 89:43[42], "allowed it to happen

---

65. See J. T. Willis, "The Song of Hannah and Psalm 113," *CBQ* 35 (1973) 139-54.

66. Bauer, 186.

67. On the genre of joyous outcries, → XI, 120; on the Yahweh royal psalms, see J. Jeremias, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen. FRLANT* 141 (1987).

68. Concerning Ecclesiastes, see II.3.f below.

69. See H. Haag, "Das Mazzenfest des Hiskia," *Wort und Geschichte. FS K. Elliger. AOAT* 18 (1973), 87-94 = *Das Buch des Bundes* (Düsseldorf, 1980), 216-25.

70. *RAC,* VIII, 375-76.

71. Contra Ruprecht, 1276.

that"), did not let the petitioner's foes rejoice (Ps. 30:2[1]), and rather "clothed me with joy" (v. 12[11]). In the didactic thanksgiving psalm (92:5[4]), God made the psalmist glad "by your work."[72] Psalms of lament use *śmḥ* piel while focusing on the future in petitions of the individual (86:4) and of the people (90:15) and in promises to bring Israel together again, namely, in the prophetic torah granting "foreigners" entry into the temple (Isa. 56:7[6]; v. 8[7] promises continuing gathering), and in the exilic expansion to the scroll of comfort (Jer. 31:13, *mîgônām,* "and give them gladness for sorrow"). Timeless statements extol God as the one who "gladdens" the king (Ps. 21:7[6]) and even extol God's commandments that "gladden" the heart (Ps. 19:9[8]). Late imitations of the "shout of jubilation" associate the person of Yahweh with joy at the land's renewed fertility (Joel 2:23, "children of Zion"), at forgiveness (Ps. 32:11; cf. v. 5), and at the preservation of the righteous (Ps. 97:12).[73] Summonses to rejoice are issued to the "king" (63:12[11]; subsequently "Davidicized"?), the "righteous" (32:11; 64:11[10]; 97:12; 118:24 [cf. v. 20]), the "poor, humble" (40:17[16]; 70:5[4]; 149:2 [joy in the "Maker"][74]), the "believers" (NRSV "righteous"; 32:11; 97:12; 149:2), and "those who seek Yahweh" (40:17[16]; 70:5[4]; cf. 105:3). This piety of the poor and humble is related to Isa. 29:19, which like Ps. 149 associates the joy of the poor with the demise of the wicked and as such points toward apocalyptic sensibilities. The psalmist/redactor of Ps. 104 also wants the wicked to disappear, at which time he will "rejoice in Yahweh" (vv. 34-35); the deeper source of his joy, however, is Yahweh's own joy "in his works" (v. 31).[75] Other self-summonses to rejoice in God focus on deliverance from one's enemies (9:3[2];[76] 118:24; cf. v. 21) and on history (66:6). The lament of the people anticipates new joy in God from his "revivifying" actions and from "seeing" his love (85:7-8[6-7]). The singers of the "new song" justify their joy with hope and trust in Yahweh, who, unlike human "strength," is genuinely able to help (33:21; cf. vv. 15-21).

Other theological texts show that such mystical statements positively emphasize Yahweh as the "highest good" (cf. 16:2) rather than negatively emphasize the absolute worthlessness of inner-worldly things. The psalmist enjoys his good fortune and "in Yahweh's presence" knows that the "fullness of joy" and "pleasures" come from Yahweh (16:9,11). The positive charge attaching to the association of "grain" *(dāgān)* and "wine" *(tîrôš)* in the parallel stich to the statement of trust "you have put gladness in my heart" (4:8[7]) makes it preferable to interpret this passage so as not to empty the (messianic) gifts of promise of their beneficent character.[77] The petitioner in Ps. 51

72. → XII, 41-42.
73. Mansfeld, 89-95.
74. → XI, 119-20.
75. Cf. O. H. Steck, "Der Wein unter den Schöpfungsgaben. Überlegungen zu Psalm 104," *Wahrnehmungen Gottes im AT. ThB* 70 (1982), 240-61.
76. → XI, 119.
77. Cf. C. Westermann, *The Living Psalms* (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1989), 124-27; concerning the background of "grain and wine" (esp. Dt. 33:28), cf. M. Mannati, "Sur le sens de min en Ps 4:8," *VT* 20 (1970) 361-66, who does not interpret *min* comparatively: "[coming from] the time of abundance" (364).

(where, contrary to the initial impression, a positively charged word field predominates) asks God to "let me hear [songs of joy]" (v. 10[8]).[78] The petitioner approaches God, who has long been a source of joy (43:4),[79] and God dwells in the midst of human beings and rejoices over them in gladness (Zeph. 3:17). Neh. 8:10 associates "eating fat and drinking sweet wine" with sharing the "joy of/in Yahweh" *(ḥeḏwaṯ yhwh)* that banishes grief and becomes one's "strength" *(mā'ōz);* Yahweh is able to suspend the ambivalence of "eating and drinking" (R. Smend overlooks the passage and its theological locus in the tension between Ex. 24:11-12 [*tôrâ*] and Isa. 25:6-8 ["weeping/tears"][80]).

f. *Ecclesiastes.* Ecclesiastes commends joy, "For there is nothing better *(ṭôḇ)* for people under the sun than to eat, and drink, and enjoy themselves" (8:15; cf. 3:12,22). Only those who overlook that the seemingly skeptical statements about joy in Ecclesiastes serve the line of argumentation or are citing someone else's opinions can speak of "pessimism" in this context. As early as his initial line of argumentation, Qoheleth has already come to realize that people can create a foundation for their own joy through wisdom and work (2:1,2,10[bis]; 10:19 seems like a summary). When he sees that "the heart of the wise is in the house of mourning, but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth" (7:4), he is ironically commenting on the proverb in v. 1 and at the same time sounding one of his primary themes: "even those who live many years should rejoice in them all, yet let them remember that the days of darkness will be many" (11:8).[81] Even when he commends joy to the young man, he ends up ultimately at the same theme (11:9; cf. 12:1-7). For Ecclesiastes, that there can be wealth without enjoyment (6:1-2) is a problem of divine enablement *(šlṭ).* Only those who stand in God's good graces *(ṭôḇ)* find joy. To them God gives *(ntn)* "wisdom and knowledge and joy" (2:26; cf. 9:7); he "enables them to enjoy [wealth and possessions] and to accept their lot and find enjoyment in [the fruits of] their toil" (5:18[19]; cf. 9:7). Amid all these gifts, God's greatest gift is that people need not think so often of death, "because God continuously answers through the joy in one's heart" (5:19[20]).[82] That Ecclesiastes uses the expression "joys of the heart" primarily in "earthly" contexts (2:10; 9:7; 11:9) militates against spiritualizing the remarkable form of divine revelation "in joy."[83]

---

78. H. Ringgren, *Psalmen* (Stuttgart, 1971), 82, suggests the presence of a "formula of absolution."

79. The cj. in Bauer, 188, is unnecessary if, as in Dnl. 1:10, *gîl* is understood as "age[-group]" (*HAL,* I, 190a).

80. "Essen und Trinken: ein Stück Weltlichkeit des AT," *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen, 1977), 446-59.

81. See N. Lohfink, *Qoheleth. CC* (Eng. trans. 2003), 134-35.

82. Ibid., 84-85.

83. Concerning this overall complex, cf. N. Lohfink, "Das Schlussgedicht des Koheletbuchs (Koh. 11,9–12,8)," *BiKi* 45 (1990) 12-19; idem, "Von Windhauch, Gottesfurcht und Gottes Antwort in der Fremde," *BiKi* 45 (1990) 26-32; idem, "Qoheleth 5:17-19: A Revelation of Joy," *CBQ* 52 (1990) 625-35 (with bibliog.).

III. 1. *Sirach.* In Sirach *śmḥ* qal occurs 6 times (3:29; 16:1,2; 18:32; 35[32]:2; 51:29), *śmḥ* piel 3 times (26:2; 32[35]:25; 51:15), and the subst. *śimḥâ* 6 times (6:4; 15:6; 30:22; 34[31]:27,28; 41:9). The LXX uses *euphrain-* and its derivatives 9 times. Sources of joy include "wisdom" (3:29; 15:6), the "capable wife" (*'ēšeṯ ḥayil,* 26:2), "wine" (34:28 [when "amply" drunk; contra LXX[84]), "grapes" (51:15), and one's own "chair of instruction" (51:29). Vetitives warn against joy in worthless children (16:1,2) and against pleasures leading to poverty (18:32). The Hebrew addition 41:9 promises "lasting joy" to those who "stumble" (*kšl;* more suitable: to the "childless" [*škl*][85]). Yahweh himself gladdens his people by his saving and just assistance (*yᵉšû'â* par. *rîḇ,* 32:25). Wine was created to "make people happy" (34:27, *yṣr* niphal, divine passive).

2. *Qumran.* The root occurs over 90 times in the Qumran writings (20 uncertain), including about 60 times in the fragments of Cave 4. Although *śmḥ* qal and piel as well as the subst. *śmḥh* are well attested, the adjective can only be inferred (4Q503 24-25, 6; 509 32:3). The majority of passages involve theological contexts. In the piel (pf.), *śmḥ* frequently takes a divine subject and human object (cf. 4Q502 33:2). It is especially in hymnic texts that biblical expressions (e.g., *śmḥ* + cultic formula [*lpny* + God], 4Q508 20:2) and forms (e.g., the "shout of jubilation" *śywn śmḥy m'dh,* "O Zion, rejoice greatly!" 1QM 12:13; 19:5; 4Q492 1:5) continue to be used. Attested synonyms include *rnn* (1QM 12:13), *śyś, gyl* (1QM 13:12); antonyms include *'bl, ygwn* (1QH 2:5).

New and in part original expressions departing from OT usage include *yḥd* + *śmḥh,* "rejoicing together" (1QM 14:4; 4Q502 4:3), *nbl śmḥh,* "harp of joy" (1QH 11:23), the personification *yśmḥ ṣdq,* "righteousness shall rejoice" (1QM 17:8), the benediction *brwk 'dwny 'šr śmḥnw,* "blessed be the Lord who has caused us to rejoice" (1Q34 2,3; 4Q509 3:9). More frequently than in the OT, the immediate context of *śmḥ* includes the terms for *'wlm,* "eternity" (often pl.; cf. 1QS 4:7), *šlwm,* "peace" (cf. 1QM 1:9), and *kbwd,* "glory" (cf. the concluding line to the Song of Zion 11QPs^a 22:15, *tśmḥ npšy bkbwdk*). New expressions mention joy in God's *'mt,* "loyalty," and *slyḥwt,* "forgiveness" (1QH 11:30-31). The inscriptions on the standards for returning from battle seem like a litany to one's "joy in God" (Neh. 8:10), including especially "Support of God" and "Joy of God" (*śmḥt 'l,* 1QM 4:13-14).[86]

Vanoni

---

84. See *HAL,* III, 1333b.

85. See E. Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des AT* (Tübingen, 1900), I, 436.

86. On the double orientation of eschatological joy (present completion of salvation and future universal redemption), see Michel, 385-86.

שִׂמְלָה *śimlâ;* שַׂלְמָה *śalmâ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. OT Occurrences; 3. Extrabiblical Texts; 4. Meaning; 5. LXX. II. OT Texts: 1. Legal Texts; 2. Narrative Texts; 3. Wisdom Language; 4. Theological Language. III. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The Heb. subst. *śimlâ,* also attested in the form *śalmâ* by way of metathesis, derives as a *qiṭl* construction from the root *śml,* itself attested only in Arabic as the vb. *šamala,* "contain, enclose, surround," subst. *šaml,* "union," *šamlat,* "cloak, turban."[1]

2. *OT Occurrences.* In the OT *śimlâ* occurs 29 times, *śalmâ* 16 times. No difference in use between the two forms can be discerned (cf. the juxtaposition of the two forms in the Covenant Code, with *śimlâ* in Ex. 22:26[Eng. 27] and *śalmâ* in Ex. 22:8,25 [9,26]).

śimlâ. H. A. Brongers, "Die metaphorische Verwendung von Termini für die Kleidung von Göttern und Menschen in der Bibel und im Alten Orient," *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. FS J. P. M. van der Ploeg. AOAT* 211 (1982), 61-74; M. Dahood, "'To Pawn One's Cloak,'" *Bibl* 42 (1961) 359-66; G. Dalman, *AuS,* V, 210-11; G. Fohrer, "Kleidung," *BHHW,* II, 962-65; H. W. Hönig, "Die Bekleidung des Hebräers" (diss., Zurich, 1957); A. Jirku, "Zur magischen bedeutung der Kleidung in Israel," *ZAW* 37 (1917/18) 109-25; M. C. A. Korpel, "A Rift in the Clouds," *Ugaritisch-biblische Literatur* 8 (1990) 364-70; E. Kutsch, *"Trauerbräuche" und "Selbstminderungsriten" im AT. ThSt* 78 (1965), 23-42 = *Kleine Schriften zum AT. BZAW* 168 (1986), 78-95; C. Locher, *Die Ehre einer Frau in Israel. OBO* 70 (1986), esp. 70, 74, 187-92; W. Magass, "Texte und Textilien. Ein Essay zur 'Semiotik der Kleidung' in der Bibel," *Linguistica Biblica* 34 (1975) 23-36; J. M. Myers, "Dress and Ornaments," *IDB,* I, 869-71; E. Otto, "Die rechtshistorische Entwicklung des Depositenrechts in altorientalischen und altisraelitischen Rechtskorpora," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte [Romanistische Abteilung]* 105 (1988) 1-31, esp. 16-25; idem, *Wandel der Rechtsbegründungen in der Gesellschaftsgeschichte des antiken Israel. StBib* 3 (1988), esp. 14-19; idem, *Rechtsgeschichte der Redaktionen im Kodex Ešnunna und im "Bundesbuch." OBO* 85 (1989), esp. 89-98; H. Petschow, "Gewand(saum) im Recht," *RLA,* III, 318-22; T. Podella, "Thematischer Vergleich zwischen Gen. 37,34-35 und KTU 1.5 VI, 23-25," *SEL* 4 (1987) 67-78; idem, *Ṣôm-Fasten. AOAT* 224 (1989), 13-15, 73-78; W. H. P. Römer, "Randbemerkungen zur Travestie von Deut. 22,5," *Travels in the World of the OT. FS M. A. Beek* (Assen, 1974), 217-22; L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33). BZAW* 188 (1990), esp. 193-211; E. Staehelin, "Tracht," *LexÄg,* VI, 726-37; E. Strommenger, "Kleidung. B. Archäologisch," *RLA,* VI, 31-38; W. Vogels, "Cham découvre les limites de son père Noé (Gen 9,20-27)," *NRT* 109 (1987) 554-73; M. E. Vogelzang and W. J. van Bekkum, "Meaning and Symbolism of Clothing in Ancient Near Eastern Texts," *Scripta signa vocis. FS J. H. Hospers* (Groningen, 1986), 265-84; M. Waefler, *Nicht-Assyrer neuassyrischer Darstellungen. AOAT* 26 (1975), 55, 67 ill. 31; 72-73, 75 ills. 38-41; 110-12, 117 ills. 54-58, 62; 121, 123 ill. 64; 137-38, 143 ill. 75; etc.; H. Waetzoldt, "Kleidung. A. Philologisch," *RLA,* VI, 18-31; H. Weippert, "Kleidung," *BRL*², 185-88; G. E. Wright, "Israelite Daily Life," *BA* 18 (1955) 50-79, esp. 61-70.

1. See *NSS,* §21c; *BLe,* 458s; *HAL,* III, 1337b. On *śalmâ* see JM, §17b; *GesB,* 788. On the Arabic see Wehr, 487.

Nor can any particular distribution pattern for the two forms be discerned in the OT, since *śimlâ* and *śalmâ* occur in the Pentateuch (7 times in Genesis; 8 each in Exodus and Deuteronomy), the Dtr History (4 times in Joshua; once each in Judges and Ruth; twice in Samuel; 3 times in Kings), the Chronicler's History (twice), the prophets (4 times in Isaiah; once in Micah), and once each in the Psalms, Canticles, Job, and Proverbs.

3. *Extrabiblical Texts.* Outside the OT, *śimlâ* occurs in Aramaic and Hebrew inscriptions.

Imperial Aramaic attests several passages from the Warka cuneiform texts using the construct state *(šá-am-lat)* with the meaning "cloak, mantle" in a metaphor mentioning *śimlâ* as the "cloth of wrath" and "cloak of rest"(?).[2]

The occasionally adduced reading of a Hebrew occurrence of *śimlâ* in the Lachish ostraca can probably not be verified.[3] The alternate reading is *k '[t] h[s] [prm k]z',* "these letters."[4]

4. *Meaning.* Both *śimlâ* and *śalmâ* refer to a specific piece of clothing as well as to garments in general. As a specific piece of clothing, *śimlâ/śalmâ* refers to a mantle or cloak/cape (Ruth 3:3, par. *miṭpaḥaṯ,* v. 15);[5] for wrapping objects in a *śimlâ,* see also Ex. 12:34; 1 S. 21:10(9); concerning spreading out a *śimlâ* for storing things, see Jgs. 8:25. When *śimlâ* refers to a "garment of clothing," it basically means an outer garment.[6] Commensurate with its function as an underlay, Ex. 22:25-26(26-27); Dt. 22:17; 24:13 also use it to mean "bed sheet."[7]

5. *LXX.* In most passages the LXX renders *śimlâ/śalmâ* as *himátion* (Gen. 9:23; 37:34; 44:13; Ex. 12:34; 19:10,14; 22:8,25,26[9,26,27]; Dt. 8:4; 10:18; 21:13; 22:3,17; 24:13; 29:4[5]; Josh. 7:6; 9:5,13; Jgs. 8:25; 1 S. 21:10[9]; 2 S. 12:20; 1 K. 11:29-30; Neh. 9:21 [= 2 Esd. 19:21 LXX]; Ps. 104:2; Prov. 30:4; Cant. 4:11; Isa. 3:6,7; 4:1; 9:4[5]). It renders isolated occurrences as *himatismós* (Ex. 3:22; 12:35; Josh. 22:8; 1 K. 10:25; Ruth 3:3; 2 Ch. 9:24) and *stolḗ* (Gen. 35:2; 41:14; 45:22; Dt. 22:5; Job 9:31).

II. OT Texts. Just as references to nakedness[8] transcend mere description by making various statements concerning the social context of a person thus described, so also references to articles of clothing in OT texts disclose various notions associated with the wearing or taking off of clothing. Contexts involving clothing also involve the no-

---

2. Ll. 20,24,30-31; see *DNSI,* II, 1162; A. Dupont-Sommer, *RA* 39 (1942/44) 37, 49-50.

3. *KAI* 195.5; contra H. Michaud, "Les ostraca de Lakiš conservés à Londres," *Syr* 34 (1957) 47-48.

4. A. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébraïques I. Les ostraca. LAPO* 9 (1977), 117; D. Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters. SBLSBS* 15 (1982), 96-97.

5. Cf. E. Zenger, *Das Buch Ruth. ZBK* 8 (1986), 67; Strommenger, 32, 37, ills. 20-21; Waefler.

6. Hönig, 54-60.

7. Locher, 74, 189 n. 281.

8. → ערום *'ārôm,* XI, 349-54.

tion of law (pledges, deposits), social matrices, sorrow, and physical protection.[9] Clothing indicates something about a person's existence; as such, references to textiles represent textual elements whose practical purpose is to disclose various situations contextually.[10]

1. *Legal Texts.* The earliest occurrences of *śimlâ/śalmâ* are found in the Covenant Code in connection with the laws governing deposits and securities/pledges. The casuistic legal stipulations in Ex. 22:6-14(7-15) deal with the question of one's obligation regarding entrusted property;[11] the deposits enumerated in v. 8(9) include ox, donkey, sheep, and *śalmâ.* This parallel positioning contextually illuminates the significance of the otherwise unspecified *śalmâ.* This mention of the *śalmâ* in v. 8(9) refers back to v. 6(7), with the more general mention of household objects *(kēlîm)* now complemented by *śalmâ.*[12] Such contexts also include the parallels *kᵉlî geḇer-śimlaṯ 'iššâ* (Dt. 22:5)[13] and *kᵉlê kesep* par. *kᵉlê zāhāḇ-śᵉmālōṯ (śᵉlāmōṯ)* (Ex. 3:22; 12:35; 1 K. 10:25 par. 2 Ch. 9:24; cf. also 11QT 49:18-19, and in general Josh. 22:8). In addition, the regulations regarding found objects (Dt. 22:1-3) also use the parallel between donkey and *śimlâ* already familiar from the Covenant Code to underscore the significance of such garments. Anyone finding these objects is to take care of them accordingly (v. 3).

In connection with the OT laws governing pledges,[14] the Covenant Code stipulates that the pledged *śalmâ* be returned by evening (Ex. 22:25[26]), reasoning that the *śimlâ* is the only covering *(kᵉsuṯôh lᵉḇaddâ)* and only wrap against exposure *(śimlāṯô lᵉ'ōrô)* in which the person can sleep (Ex. 22:26[27]). Dt. 24:10-13 contains an analogous regulation similarly stipulating the return of the pledge before sunset so that the debtor can sleep in his *śalmâ (šāḵaḇ bᵉśalmāṯô).* Concerning clothing as pledges, cf. also Dt. 24:17; Job 22:6; 24:10; Prov. 20:16 (= 27:13); Am. 2:8.

The pledge regulations codified in Ex. 22:25-26(26-27) and Dt. 24:10-13 are illustrated by the situation described in the Hebrew ostracon from Mesad Hashavyahu.[15] Here a harvest worker who has pledged his garment *(beged)* goes to court to get his garment back. The ostracon, dating to the time of Josiah, reveals the discrepancy between OT legal regulations on the one hand and actual legal praxis on the other.[16]

In connection with the legal accusation of one's wife for having engaged in premarital sex, Dt. 22:17 stipulates *ûpārᵉśû haśśimlâ lipnê ziqnê hā'îr.* Like Ex. 22:25-26(26-27) and Dt. 24:13, this passage assumes that the *śimlâ* is used at night as a cover or sheet.

---

9. → לבשׁ *lāḇēš,* VII, 461-62; Vogelzang and van Bekkum, 265-66.

10. Magass, 30.

11. On the redactional history of these passages, see Otto, *Rechtsgeschichte,* 92-96; Schwienhorst-Schönberger, 194-211.

12. Otto, "Rechtshistorische Entwicklung," 18; → VII, 171-73.

13. On *kēlîm* as a term for clothing in legal texts, → VII, 173.

14. → חבל II *ḥāḇal (chābhal),* IV, 182-83 (§II); → נשׂא II *nāšā',* X, 55-59; → ערב I *'āraḇ,* XI, 326-30; → עבט *'āḇaṭ,* X, 405-7.

15. *KAI* 200; see Lemaire, *Ostraca,* 264, 267-68.

16. Concerning clothing as pledges in Elephantine, see *BMAP* 11.10 (cf. also *AP* 10.8-11). Ahiqar 11.171 (with an appeal to Shamash) and Mt. 5:40 attest the pledging of a cloak.

Other legal contexts understand the *śimlâ* as a certain kind of garb. Dt. 21:13 stipulates that when a female captive marries, she is to discard her captive's garb *(śimlaṯ šiḇyâ).* The *tô'ēḇâ* stipulation in Dt. 22:5 prohibits men from wearing women's clothing *(śimlaṯ 'iššâ).*

This prohibition against transvestites in Dt. 22:5 is often classified as an anti-Canaanite measure within the overall framework of the *tô'ēḇâ* regulations, though some scholars disagree.[17] With regard to the praxis reproached in Dt. 22:5, however, a more likely reference is to the Inanna-Ishtar cult.[18]

2. *Narrative Texts.* Within narrative texts the terms *śimlâ* and *śalmâ* occur in various contexts involving daily life.

a. Gen. 9:23 speaks of how Noah's nakedness is covered. Rather than addressing the notion of incest,[19] the text reproaches the son for his failure to cover his father with the *śimlâ* so as to spare his father the disgrace of nakedness.[20]

b. Changing one's *śimlâ* plays a role in various contexts. It indicates a certain degree of wealth that a person has enough garments to change in the first place. To that extent it is understandable that the OT expression *ḥᵃlipôṯ śᵉmālōṯ* refers to a luxury gift that Joseph gives to his brothers, with Benjamin even receiving five such changes of garments (Gen. 45:22; cf. 2 K. 5:5). Hence one is also justified in translating *ḥᵃlipôṯ śᵉmālōṯ* as "festal robes."[21] Similarly, poverty is indicated by a person having no change of clothing, such as is the case with the poor man of Nippur[22] and the poor person (Ex. 22:25-26[26-27]; Dt. 24:13) who depends on his one, pledged *śimlâ* for covering at night.

Changing clothes also takes place in connection with the cult. For Jacob's arrival in Bethel, Gen. 35:2 stipulates that his household remove all foreign gods, purify themselves,[23] and change clothes. After his futile pleas for his son's life (2 S. 12:16-19), David similarly rises from the ground, washes and anoints himself, changes his clothes, and goes to the sanctuary (v. 20). When released from prison, Joseph also changes his clothes before entering Pharaoh's presence (Gen. 41:14).

c. The washing of the *śimlâ* occurs in yet another cultic context associated with preparations for the Sinai theophany (Ex. 19:10,14).[24] Regarding the changing of dirty clothes as a symbol of purification from sin, see Zech. 3:1-5.

---

17. For the anti-Canaanite classification see P. Humbert, "Le substantif *tô'ēbā* et le verbe *t'b* dans l'AT," *ZAW* 72 (1960) 225; J. L'Hour, "Les interdits *to'eba* dans le Deutéronome," *RB* 71 (1964) 500; R. P. Merendino, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz. BBB* 31 (1969), 326-36, 398. For one who disagrees see H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 119.

18. Römer, 219-22.

19. Contra F. W. Bassett, "Noah's Nakedness and the Curse of Canaan," *VT* 21 (1971) 232-37.

20. → ערה *'ārâ*, XI, 346.

21. C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50. CC* (Eng. trans. 1986), 140, 147-48; J. Scharbert, *Genesis 12–50. NEB* (1986), 276; → IV, 433.

22. J. S. Cooper, "Structure, Humor, and Satire in the Poor Man of Nippur," *JCS* 27 (1975) 163-74.

23. → טהר *ṭāhar,* V, 287-96.

24. → כבס *kāḇas,* VII, 40-42.

d. The tearing of the *śimlâ* as a gesture of sorrow is portrayed in Gen. 37:34; 44:13; Josh. 7:6; this gesture is part of the larger context of mourning customs. Gen. 37:34 portrays the tearing of one's daily clothes and the subsequent putting on of mourning clothes (cf. also Isa. 32:11; Ezk. 26:16), expressing symbolically the contrast between life and mourning through the notion of being fully or scantily clothed.[25]

e. Dtr theology recounts that during Israel's wilderness wanderings, the Israelites' clothing did not wear out (Dt. 8:4 par. Neh. 9:21; Dt. 29:4[5]) nor did their feet or shoes suffer damage, a sign of Yahweh's favor toward his people.[26] The contrasting image is that of the cunning Gibeonites who put on "worn-out, patched sandals and worn-out clothes" to suggest that they had come from afar (Josh. 9:5,13). These texts recall the OT image of clothes as a symbol of transitoriness (Job 13:28; Ps. 102:27[26]; Isa. 50:9; 51:6).

f. The connotation of the *śimlâ* as one of life's necessities emerging in these and certain legal texts (Ex. 22:15-16[16-17]; Dt. 24:13) recurs in passages mentioning the *śimlâ* in connection with poverty. Hence food and the *śimlâ* are God's gifts for the stranger (Dt. 10:18). Concerning clothing as a gift to those in distress, cf. Job 31:19-20; Ezk. 18:7,16. By contrast, during times of trouble people have neither bread nor *śimlâ* in their houses (Isa. 3:7). Hence the women looking for a husband during the time of distress insist that they, instead of the husband, will provide their own bread and *śimlâ* (4:1), whereby in view of their own distress following the war (3:26–4:1) they renounce the right enjoyed by women in Israel (cf. by contrast the stipulation that the husband continue to provide for the clothing, food, and marital rights of his first wife according to Ex. 21:10 and the withdrawal of clothing from the adulterous woman according to Hos. 2:5[3],[27] and the additional references to food and clothing as signs of wealth in 1 K. 10:4-5; Eccl. 9:7-8). The juxtaposition of bread and *śimlâ* in Dt. 10:18; Josh. 9:5,12-13; Isa. 3:7; 4:1 can be viewed as a merism expressing the notion that food and clothing are fundamental to human life (cf. also Gen. 28:20).

g. Isa. 3:6-7 uses the *śimlâ* as a sign of office designating a leader; 1 K. 11:29-30 perhaps uses *śalmâ* similarly. In the latter passage the tearing of the garment is a symbolic act by which the prophet symbolizes the division of the Davidic-Solomonic kingdom into two separate states. Clothing also serves as an element of symbolic prophetic acts in 1 K. 19:13,19; 2 K. 2:8,13-14; Isa. 20:1-6; Jer. 13:1-11; Ezk. 24:15-24.

h. One part of the spoils of war to be destroyed in Isa. 9:4(5) is the *śimlâ* (cf. in this regard Josh. 7:24-25).[28] The *śimlâ/śalmâ* also appears as spoils (of war) in Ex. 3:22; 12:35; Josh. 22:8; cf. Jgs. 14:19. Mic. 2:8 parallels the robbing of the poor and the robbing of the spoils of war.[29]

i. As an indication of wealth, *śimlâ/śalmâ* appear not only as ceremonial garments

---

25. Podella, "Thematischer Vergleich," 68, 72; on the ancient Near East see Waetzold, 25-26. On mourning clothes → שַׂק *śaq,* XIV, 184-89.

26. A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Nehemia. KAT* XIX/2 (1987), 127.

27. → XI, 353-54; on the ancient Near East see Petschow, 319.

28. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 398.

29. On textual questions see H. W. Wolff, *Micah. CC* (Eng. trans. 1990), 71, 73-74.

(Gen. 45:22) but also as parts of gifts (1 K. 10:25; for clothes as gifts see Gen. 24:53; Jgs. 14:12-13; 2 K. 5:5,22-23,26).[30]

j. Cant. 4:11 compares the scent of the bride's garments with the scent of Lebanon (cf. in this regard Hos. 14:7[6]), the reference probably being to the fragrance of cedars.[31]

3. *Wisdom Language.* In a wisdom comparison, Prov. 30:4 asks, *mî ṣārar mayim baśśimlâ;* because the *śimlâ* can only be used to wrap solid objects, however, the question is in fact rhetorical, since water would seep through the material. On the other hand, Yahweh, the Creator, is able to "bind up water in his thick clouds" (Job 26:8). With its own question, Prov. 30:4 focuses on God's power within his own creation, a power inaccessible to human beings.[32]

Job 9:31 says that Job's own clothes *(śalmôṯāy)* will abhor him if as a sign of Job's sin God plunges Job into filth (cf. Isa. 64:5[6]; Zech. 3:1-5). This is the only passage that personifies clothes.

4. *Theological Language.* In contrast to human beings, God is nowhere directly said to be clothed.[33] Isa. 6:1 mentions the "hem" of Yahweh's robe, Ezk. 16:8 the edge of his cloak, Dnl. 7:9 the clothing of the Ancient One, and Isa. 63:1-3 Yahweh's bloodstained garments. Ps. 60:10(8) and 108:10(9) mention Yahweh's sandals. On the other hand, it is especially the works of creation that are described as Yahweh's cosmic garments.[34] In this context, speaking metaphorically, Ps. 104:2 also mentions how Yahweh is "wrapped in light as with a garment *(kaśśalmâ).*" Isa. 59:17 is comparable in its assertion that Yahweh wraps himself in vengeance for garments *(bᵉgāḏîm)* and in fury as in a mantle *(kamᵉʿîl).* Concerning Yahweh clothing himself, see also Ps. 65:7(6); 93:1; Isa. 51:9.[35]

III. Qumran. The Qumran/Essene literature uses *śimlâ* in connection with the Dtn reception of the laws regulating war (11QT 63:13) and the proof of a woman's innocence (11QT 65:13).

The form *śalmâ* occurs in 11QT 49:18. According to the regulation for interring the dead, all persons who have been in the house where the person died must bathe and wash their clothes and garments (vv. 16-21).

Niehr

---

30. Concerning the ancient Near East see Waetzold, 30.
31. G. Gerleman, *Ruth/Das Hohelied. BK* XVIII (²1981), 156.
32. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 359.
33. On the ancient Near East see Waetzold, 28-30.
34. → VII, 463.
35. See in this regard Brongers, 61-62.

שָׂנֵא *śānē'*; שׂנֵא *śōnē'*; מְשַׂנֵּא *m^eśannē'*; שִׂנְאָה *śin'â*

Contents: I. Occurrences and Use. II. The Verb. III. The Nouns: 1. *śōnē'* and *m^eśannē'*; 2. *śin'â.* IV. Divine Hate. V. Ethical Considerations. VI. Legal Use: 1. Divorce; 2. Murder. VII. Qumran.

I. Occurrences and Use. The root *śn',* "hate," is attested in Hebrew *(śānē'),* Ugaritic *(šn'),* Phoenician *(šn'),* Moabite *(šn'),* Aramaic *(šn'),* Syriac *(s^enā')* and modern Aramaic *(sny),* South Arabian inscriptions *(šn'),* and Classical and Modern Arabic *(šana'a).* By contrast, Akkadian uses the vb. *zêru* with its dialect forms *ze'āru, ze'ēru, zâru* for this meaning.[1] The LXX usually renders *śn'* as *miseín* and its derivatives, using it as the explicit antonym to "love" (Dt. 21:15-17; Jgs. 14:16; 2 S. 13:15; 19:7; Ps. 11:5; 45:8[Eng. 7]; 97:10; Prov. 8:13; 12:1; 13:24; Eccl. 3:8; Isa. 61:8; Ezk. 16:37; Am. 5:15; Mic. 3:2; Zech. 8:17; Mal. 1:2-3). The term *śn'* is applied to the relationships between man and woman (Gen. 29:31,33; Dt. 21:15-17; 22:13,16; 24:3; Jgs. 14:16; 2 S. 13:15; Ezk. 16:37), though also to relationships between brothers, fellow citizens, and national comrades (Gen. 26:27; 37:4,5,8; Lev. 19:17; Jgs. 11:7; 2 S. 13:22). Anthropomorphically *śn'* also refers to God's own feeling of hate.[2]

II. The Verb. The vb. *śānē',* "hate," refers to an emotional condition of aversion that OT anthropology locates "in the heart" (*lēḇ,* Lev. 19:17) or in the *nepeš* (2 S. 5:8; Ps. 11:5). Although it does not necessarily indicate that wicked intentions accompany such hate, it does imply a distancing from the hated person, that person's removal from the surroundings of the person who hates. Hence Isaac says to Abimelech, Ahuzzath, and Phicol, "Why have you come to me, seeing that you hate *(ś^enē'ṯem)* me and have sent me away from you?" (Gen. 26:27). The same situation recurs in the story of Jephthah, who turns to the elders of Gilead with the words, "Are you not the very ones who hated me and drove me out of my father's house? So why do you come to me now when you are in trouble?" (Jgs. 11:7). In both cases expulsion is the consequence of hate. Hate generally excludes the possibility of visiting or helping the hated person. The king of Israel does not want to seek out the prophet Micaiah son of Imlah because "I hate him,

---

śānē'. K.-A. Abraham, "Echtscheiding volgens de Elefantine huwelijkscontracten" (diss., Leuven, 1985); R. D. Branson, "A Study of the Hebrew Term שׂנא" (diss., Boston University, 1976); J. N. Epstein, "Zu den jüdisch-aramäischen Papyri von Assuan," *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft* 6 (1908) 359-73, esp. 368ff.; M. A. Friedman, *Jewish Marriage in Palestine: A Cairo Genizah Study* (2 vols.; New York, 1980), esp. I, 312-46; E. Jenni, "שׂנא *śn'* to hate," *TLOT,* III, 1277-79; E. Y. Kutscher, *Hebrew and Aramaic Studies* (Jerusalem, 1977), esp. 38, 42; C. Locher, *Die Ehre einer Frau in Israel. OBO* 70 (1986), esp. 296-99; R. Westbrook, *Old Babylonian Marriage Law. BAfO* 23 (1988), esp. 20-23, 69-84.

1. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1338b; *AHw,* III, 1522; *CAD,* XXI, 97-99.
2. See IV below.

for he never prophesies anything favorable about me, but only disaster" (1 K. 22:8-9; 2 Ch. 18:7-8). According to Ezk. 23:28, the prostitute Oholibah, who symbolizes Jerusalem, has separated herself from those who hate her.

The wisdom proverb relates that "if the poor are hated even by their kin, how much more are they shunned by their friends!" (Prov. 19:7; cf. 14:20). Hatred leads to separation. Such hate can be provoked by surfeit, which in its own turn can be prompted by the ongoing presence of a person: "Let your foot be seldom in your neighbor's house, otherwise the neighbor will become weary of you and hate you" (25:17).

Vehement love can analogously change to vehement hate. Amnon comes to hate Tamar and eventually expels her from the house (2 S. 13:15). Leah was "hated" by Jacob (*śᵉnû'â,* Gen. 29:31,33). Although he wishes her no ill, his hatred manifests itself in coolness and emotional distance.

The wise do indeed advise us not to trust ourselves to one whom we hate (Sir. 7:26) and include in their enumeration of unbearable things also "an unloved woman when she gets a husband" (*śᵉnû'â kî ṯibbā'ēl;* Prov. 30:23). Nonetheless, hatred of one's spouse implies neither the denial of sexual relations (Gen. 29:31-33) nor the withdrawal of the rights from the firstborn son of the detested spouse provided that he genuinely is the firstborn (Dt. 21:15-17). A similar nuance emerges in the story of Joseph and the brothers who "hate" him (Gen. 37:4,5,8) and are unable to "speak peaceably *(lᵉšālôm)* to him" (v. 4). The absence of friendly relations was thus an expression of their "hatred" just as Absalom's hatred of Amnon manifests itself in Absalom speaking "to Amnon neither good nor bad" (2 S. 13:22). This mention of personal distance also emerges unmistakably in the background to the puzzling passage 2 S. 5:8, according to which David's *nepeš* hates "the lame and the blind." This surprising statement might have been inspired by a ritual regulation such as that in Lev. 21:18, which states that the lame and the blind are unsuitable for serving in worship. Although this regulation has no direct connection with the context, it is anticipated by the proverb cited in 2 S. 5:6.

Ezk. 35:6, often unjustifiably emended, associates the notion of distance with "hatred" in metaphorical expressions. The imprecatory formula is introduced by *'im-lō':* "(Woe to you) if you do not hate bloodshed; therefore bloodshed shall pursue you." Although Mt. Seir, to which this oracle is directed, wishes to distance itself from bloodshed at any price, that blood will pursue it. It is in the same sense that one can issue the warning against standing surety for someone by saying, "he who hates suretyship is secure" (Prov. 11:15). In Syriac, where the root *sn'* is well attested,[3] such usage led to the frequent use of *sᵉnā'* to mean "not want to."

III. The Nouns.

1. *śōnē' and mᵉśannē'.* Two substantives deriving from the root *śn'* mean "enemy": the qal act. ptcp. *śōnē'* and the piel act. ptcp. **mᵉśannē',* used only in poetic texts and corresponding to the pual *yśwn'* in Sir. 9:18. The term **mᵉśannē'* serves in some passages to refer to God's enemies (Nu. 10:35; Dt. 32:41; Ps. 68:2[1]; 81:16[15]; 83:3[2];

3. R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus,* II (Oxford, 1897), 2668-71.

139:21). Those who hate *(*m^e^śannē')* the Wisdom merely injure themselves (Prov. 8:36). Relatively ancient texts also use it to refer to enemies of the psalmist (2 S. 22:41 = Ps. 18:41[40]; 55:13[12]), of the Davidic king (89:24[23]), of Israel (44:8,11[7,10]), and of Levi in Moses' testamentary blessing (Dt. 33:11). In one instance it refers to Job's adversaries (Job 31:29). The ptcp. *śōnē'* appears in both prose and poetic texts and can be used parallel with *'ōyēḇ,* "enemy" (Ex. 23:4-5; Lev. 26:16-17; Dt. 30:7; 2 S. 22:18; Est. 9:5,16; Ps. 18:18[17]; 35:19; 38:20[19]) 106:10,41-42), usage already attested in Late Bronze Age Canaanite poetry (Ugarit). In the Baʿal cycle one encounters the parallel terms *ỉb* par. *šn'*: *ỉb b'l tỉḫd y'rm* par. *šn'u hd gpt ġr,* "Baʿal's enemies take to the woods, Hadd's foes to the caverns of the mountain."[4] In the OT it often refers to one's personal enemies (Ex. 23:5; 2 S. 19:7[6]; 22:18; Job 8:22; Ps. 9:14[13]; 18:18[17]; 35:19; 38:20[19]; 41:8[7]; 69:15[14]; 86:17; 118:7; Prov. 25:21; 27:6; Sir. 6:4; 18:31), especially in regulations concerning cities of asylum (Dt. 4:42; 19:4,6,11; Josh. 20:5) and in reference to the enemies of the king (2 S. 19:7[6]; 2 Ch. 1:11; Ps. 21:9[8]; cf. Dnl. 4:16[19]). The same usage is attested in Moabite and Old Aramaic.[5] The term **m^e^śannē'* can refer to the enemies of the people of God (Lev. 26:17; Dt. 7:15; 30:7; Est. 9:1,5,16; Ps. 106:10,41; Isa. 66:5; Ezk. 16:27) and of Zion (Ps. 129:5). The ptcp. *śōnē'* can also qualify God's enemies, albeit much less frequently than does **m^e^śannē'* (Dt. 7:10; 2 Ch. 19:2), especially in the Decalog (Ex. 20:5; Dt. 5:9): "For I am a jealous God, punishing children for the iniquity of parents, to the third and fourth generation of those hostile to me *(l^e^śōn^e^'āy).*"

2. *śin'â.* The subst. *śin'â,* "hatred," qualifies murder as opposed to unpremeditated manslaughter (Nu. 35:20). The curses in the Phoenician inscription of Karatepe against those who might desecrate the name of Azitawadda distinguish between those who act from "greed" *(bḥmdt)* and those who act out of "hatred and evil" *(bšn't wbr').*[6] Metaphorically *śin'â* illustrates the murderous deeds the Edomites undertook in Judah (Ezk. 35:11). The term also characterizes Amnon's change of disposition toward Tamar when he expels her after the rape (2 S. 13:15) and that of Oholibah's lovers, Oholibah now finding herself robbed of the fruit of her prostitution (Ezk. 23:29). Elsewhere *śin'â* emphasizes the violence of hatred the psalmist's enemies direct toward him (Ps. 25:19; 109:3,5) or which in a reverse fashion he harbors toward his enemies (Ps. 139:22). The wise view hatred as the origin of legal disputes (Prov. 10:12), warn against deceivers (Prov. 10:18; 15:17; 26:26), or adduce the transitoriness of hatred (Eccl. 9:6). The verbal subst. *śin'â* with the accusative can also refer to the hatred God allegedly harbors against his own people: "It is because Yahweh hates us *(b^e^śin'aṯ yhwh 'ōṯānû)* that he has brought us out of the land of Egypt" (Dt. 1:27); "Because he hated them *(miśśin'āṯô 'ōṯām),* he has brought them out to let them die in the wilderness" (Dt. 9:28).

---

4. *KTU* 1.4, VII, 35-37; *ANET,* 135a, ll. 35-37.
5. *KAI* 181.4; cf. Ps. 118:7; *KAI* 222B.26; 223B.14; 224.10-12.
6. *KAI* 26A III 17; *ANET,* 654b.

IV. Divine Hate. The feeling of hate is ascribed to God just as are other human feelings such as love, remorse, jealousy, and wrath. The anthropomorphic/anthropopathic use of the verb "hate" is similarly attested in Mesopotamian literature. Ea advises Utnapishtim to explain the preparations for the coming flood to his fellow citizens by pretending *yâši Enlil izêrannima,* "Enlil hates me, so that I cannot reside in your city."[7] In the great hymn to the sun god, the petitioner directs the following plea to Shamash: *ana yâti dŠamaš la tazêršināti,* "for my sake, O Šamaš, do not hate them."[8] A Sargon inscription reads: "Marduk . . . saw the misdeeds of the Chaldeans, whom he hates *(ša izêru).*"[9]

In the OT Yahweh directs his hate less against concrete persons than against certain behaviors. He "hates" the originally Canaanite cultic practices (Dt. 12:31), especially the erection of sacred pillars (Dt. 16:22; cf. 11QT 52:2) and the cult of alien gods (Jer. 44:4). He similarly displays great repugnance toward the hypocritical festivals of his people (Isa. 1:14; Am. 5:21) and the pilfered goods offered as sacrifices (Isa. 61:8). One can ompare this text with a passage from the Ugaritic Ba'al cycle in which Ba'al complains that human beings pay him only stingy, unworthy homage: "For two [kinds of offering] banquets Ba'al hates *(šn' B'l),* three the Rider of the Clouds: a banquet of shamefulness, a banquet of baseness, and a banquet of handmaids' debauch."[10] Yahweh also hates false oaths (Zech. 8:17), wickedness (*reša',* Ps. 45:8[7]), though also kingship in Israel (Hos. 9:15), which was established at Gilgal (1 S. 11:14-15) but then cursed (1 S. 13:7-14; 15:10-23). God's "hate" manifests itself in his distance, as Jer. 12:7-8 states explicitly: because God "hates" his house and heritage, he abandons them and delivers them into the hands of their enemies. According to Am. 6:8, he "hates the strongholds" of Israel and delivers up his cities to their enemies. God's "hate" toward his own people is also expressed by the verbal subst. *śin'â* with an accusative (Dt. 1:27; 9:28). God also shows his hatred toward Esau-Edom (Mal. 1:3); he "hates" evildoers (Ps. 5:6[5]) and those who love violence (11:5) as well as those who worship useless idols (31:7[6]). Prov. 6:16-19 enumerates seven abominable deeds that God hates (cf. Sir. 10:7).

V. Ethical Considerations. Combined with other terms, *śānē'* can also refer to positive moral behavior and disposition, including *śōnᵉ'ê beṣa',* "those who hate dishonest gain," i.e., those who cannot be bribed (Ex. 18:21; Prov. 28:16; cf. 11QT 57:9); *śōnē' mattānôṯ,* "those who hate gifts," i.e., the honest worker (Prov. 15:27; NRSV "those who hate bribes"). Several contrasting pairs express similar notions: *śin'û-rā' wᵉ'ehᵉḇû ṭôḇ,* "hate evil and love good," the prophet cries (Am. 5:15); the psalmist admonishes, *'ōhᵃḇê yhwh śin'û rā',* "You who love Yahweh, hate evil" (Ps. 97:10); and the wise person advocates the maxim *yir'aṯ yhwh śᵉnō'ṯ rā',* "the fear of Yahweh is hatred of evil" (Prov. 8:13). One should hate iniquity (Ps. 36:3[2]), falsehood (Ps. 119:163; Prov.

7. Gilg. XI, 39-40; *ANET,* 93b, ll. 39-40.
8. *BWL,* 134, l. 148.
9. A. G. Lie, *The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria,* I (Paris, 1929), 268.
10. *KTU,* 1.4, III, 17-21; *ANET,* 132b, iii, 17-21.

13:5), every false way (Ps. 119:104,128), double-mindedness (Ps. 119:113), haughtiness and arrogance, evil deeds and falseness (Prov. 8:13; Sir. 10:7), and finally God's enemies. The psalmist confesses, *śānē'ṯî qᵉhal mᵉrē'îm,* "I hate the company of evildoers" (Ps. 26:5), and asks God, *hᵃlō'-mᵉśan'eyḵā yhwh 'eśnā',* "Do I not hate those who hate you, O Yahweh? . . . I hate them with perfect hatred" (139:21-22); "I hate the work of those who fall away" (101:3).

By contrast, morally negative behavior can be indicated by expressions such as "you who hate the good and love the evil" (*śōnᵉ'ê ṭôḇ wᵉ'ōhᵃḇê rā',* Mic. 3:2), who "hate the one who judges justly *(môḵîaḥ)* in the gate," where judgment is administered (Am. 5:10), who "hate justice" (Job 34:17) or the law (Sir. 33:2), who hate the righteous (Ps. 34:22[21]) and the blameless (Prov. 29:10). Those who hate discipline (Ps. 50:17; Prov. 5:12), rebuke (Prov. 12:1; 15:10), knowledge (Prov. 1:22,29), and peace (Ps. 120:6) will fare similarly. An immoral and unjust disposition betrays "hatred toward oneself" (*śônē' napšô,* Prov. 29:24).

One common wisdom theme is that scoffers "hate" those who rebuke them (Prov. 9:8), and that "a lying tongue hates its victims" (26:28). On the other hand, a "schemer is hated" (14:17), as is "one who is reckless in speech" (Sir. 9:18, pual). Those who hate are able to dissemble their intentions (Prov. 26:24). The psalmist's enemies obviously "hate" him: *śin'aṯ ḥāmās śᵉnē'ûnî,* "they hate me with such violence" (Ps. 25:19), *rabbû . . . śōnᵉ'ay ḥinnām,* "numerous . . . are those who hate me without cause" (Ps. 69:5[4]). Yahweh himself changes the attitude of the Egyptians toward the Israelites into hate (Ps. 105:25).

In a seeming paradox, the wisdom teacher says that "those who spare the rod hate their children" (*ḥôśēḵ šibṭô śônē' bᵉnô,* Prov. 13:24). Ecclesiastes' skeptical statements result from a weariness of life and useless toil (Eccl. 2:17-18), since ultimately everything is decreed elsewhere, for there is "a time to love, and a time to hate" (*'ēṯ le'ᵉhōḇ wᵉ'ēṯ liśnō',* 3:8).

VI. Legal Use.

1. *Divorce.* Use of the qal pass. ptcp. *śᵉnû'â* to refer to the unloved wife in a polygamous marriage (Gen. 29:31,33; Dt. 21:15-17; Prov. 30:23; cf. Isa. 60:15; Sir. 7:26) closely resembles the use of the vb. *śānē'* as a technical term referring to the legal grounds for divorce. Although such use is attested in Dt. 22:13,16; 24:3; Mal. 2:16 (cf. Sir. 42:9), its meaning emerges more clearly in the Jewish Aramaic papyri of Elephantine.[11] Analysis of the term *śn'* in these 5th-century-B.C.E. texts has yielded differing interpretations of *śn'*.

One view holds that *śn'* originally referred to the mutual disappearance of feeling between spouses and to the cessation of sexual relations. By analogy with Babylonian law, which uses the vb. *zêru,* "hate," in connection with divorce, the West Semitic vb. *śn'* may take on the same meaning. The condition put forth in the Code of Hammurabi

---

11. *AP* 9.8; 15.23,27; *BMAP* 2.7-9; 7.21-22,25; cf. *AP* 18.1; *BMAP* 7.34,37,39-40; *TADAE* B2.4.8; B2.6.23,27; B3.3.7-9; B3.8.21-22,25; cf. B3.8.34,37,39-40.

(§142), "if a woman so hated her husband that . . ." (*šumma sinništu musa izîrma . . .*), recalls the formulation of Dt. 22:13 as well as the clause in the Old Babylonian contracts using the verb "hate."[12] Another view holds that even *śn'* was a verb of action with the juridical sense of "divorce."

A compromise position mediates between the understanding as an action or stative verb designating an emotional condition and leads to translations such as "disown, repudiate" or "desire a divorce." Use of *śn'* in Hebrew, in any event, leaves no doubt that this verb expresses an emotional condition implying the wish for separation or removal from the "hated" person. In that sense one cannot view it as a verb of action designating actual divorce.

Its use as a technical term in connection with divorce, however, cannot be doubted, so that one is advised to seek the origins of this specifically juridical use of *śn'*. The hypothesis of Egyptian influence on the contract of Elephantine has probably been sufficiently refuted, since *śn'* is already used to mean the same thing in Dt. 22:13,16; 24:3. Its use in the Akkadian of Alalakh and in Neo-Assyrian contracts of a Phoenician milieu[13] exactly parallel that of *zêru* in Old Babylonian (as in CH §142 above) and probably reflects ancient West Semitic terminology. Its origin can be easily understood in light of the practice of repudiating one's wife and of its ethnological parallels. A husband is thus permitted to expel his wife. The acceptable ground in Dt. 24:1 is that "she does not please him because he finds something objectionable about her." This expression is extremely general, and according to rabbinic interpretation it sufficed merely that another woman pleases the husband better.[14] Sir. 25:26 already suggested that "if she [your wife] does not go as you direct, separate her from yourself." The formalities for such disownment were simple. The husband speaks the formula of divorce (Hos. 2:4[2]) and "writes her a bill of divorce" (Dt. 24:1,3; Isa. 50:1; Jer. 3:8). If a marriage contract did not otherwise restrict the husband's rights, the grounds for disownment could derive merely from his personal feeling. If a woman no longer pleases her husband, if he no longer finds her attractive, if he wishes to marry another woman without being able to support two wives, he can simply disown "the wife of his youth" (Mal. 2:15). As an expression of the husband's feelings, hate (*śn'*) as the opposite of love (*'hb*) is sufficient reason for divorcing a woman. This technical use of "hate" continues into the Jerusalem Talmud and the Cairo Genizah documents dating to the 10th/11th century C.E., whereas the Babylonian Talmud uses a different formula. It is doubtless attributable to Aramaic influence in Egypt that *mst,* "hate," is used in Demotic marriage contracts, which cannot be dated prior to the Persian period.[15]

The juridical meaning of *śn'* seems to emerge clearly and unequivocally from *AP* 9.8-9 thanks to the vb. *nqp,* "go away," which in Aramaic refers to the effected divorce;

---

12. E.g., *VAB* V (1913), no. 33.10.

13. See D. J. Wiseman, *The Alalakh Tablets* (London, 1953), 92.6; 94.19; J. N. Postgate, *Fifty Neo-Assyrian Legal Documents* (Warminster, 1976), nos. 14:46,48,49; idem, "On Some Assyrian Ladies," *Iraq* 41 (1979) 98, 19′.

14. Mish. *Giṭ.* 9:10; cf. Bab. *Giṭ.* 90a; *Num. Rab.* 9:30.

15. W. Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar* (Copenhagen, 1954), 180.

Hebrew similarly uses the vb. *šlḥ* piel, "send away" (Dt. 22:19; 24:1; 1 Ch. 8:8; Isa. 50:1; Jer. 3:1,8; Mal. 2:16; cf. Dt. 21:14), when speaking about the husband, and the expressions *yāṣā'*, "go away" (Dt. 24:2), or *hālak*, "go away" (Dt. 24:2; Jer. 3:1,8), when speaking about the expelled woman. In such instances Akkadian uses the vb. *ezēbu*, "leave, abandon."[16] Interestingly, ancient Athenian law uses an analogous term to refer to divorce. The husband expelling his wife uses the vbs. *apopémpein*, *ekpémpein*, "send away," and *ekbállein*, "expel," while the wife separating from her husband uses the vb. *apoleípein*, "leave."[17] On the other hand, the LXX translates *šlḥ* piel in Dt. 22:19; 24:1; Isa. 50:1; Jer. 3:1,8; Mal. 2:16 (cf. Dt. 21:14) as *exapostéllein*, and in 1 Ch. 8:8 as *apostéllein*.

The Jewish Aramaic text *AP* 9 (*TADAE* B2.4) is a deed of gift, the aim of which is to guarantee the rights of the transferrer's grandsons. He addresses his son-in-law with the words: "If tomorrow or some other day you build upon this land, and then my daughter [Mibtahiah] divorces [i.e., comes to hate] you and leaves you, she shall have no power to take it or give it to others; only your children by Mibtahiah shall have power over it."[18]

The juridical use of *npq* as a technical term for "divorce" occurs regularly in later rabbinic writings. By contrast, neither the Mishnah nor the Tgs. nor talmudic authors use *śn'* in connection with divorce, with the exception of Aramaic translations of biblical texts and three passages in the Jerusalem Talmud.[19] One encounters only *npq* in the Babylonian Talmud, for instance, in the following sentence: "If she divorces [*npq'*, lit. 'goes away'], then the elders also determine a *ketubah* for him [the husband] from her [the wife's] side."[20] The vb. *śn'*, which precedes *npq* in *AP* 9.8-9, indicates the emotional state constituting the legal grounds for actual divorce, which in its own turn is then indicated by *npq*.

Other documents use a different formula:"If tomorrow or another day Anani should stand up in an assembly and say: 'I hate [divorce] my wife Yehoyishma, she shall not be my wife,' the money of hatred [divorce money] is on his head. . . and if Yehoyishma hates [divorces] her husband Ananiah and says to him, 'I hate [divorce] you. I will not be your wife,' the money of hatred [divorce money] is on her head."[21] In this example the formulation of legal grounds ("I hate") is followed by the formula effecting the divorce whose equivalent occurs in Hos. 2:4(2): "She is not my wife, and I am not her husband." The resulting legal consequence is the separation of the spouses, indicated by one of the verbs meaning "go away."

Other texts reduce the formula to the words "I hate my wife" and "I hate my hus-

---

16. *CAD*, IV, 422; *AHw*, I, 267-68.

17. E. Weiss, *Griechisches Privatrecht auf rechtsvergleichender Grundlage* (Leipzig, 1923), 309ff.; A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, I (Oxford, 1968), 39ff.

18. *AP* 9.8-10; *TADAE* B2.4.8-10; *ANET*, 222b, ll. 8-10.

19. *Ketub.* 5, 10, 30b; 7, 6, 31c; *B. Bat.* 8, 9, 16c. Cf. *WTM*, III, 556; IV, 584; Jastrow, 1006-7, 1604.

20. E.g., *Giṭ.* 49b.

21. *BMAP* 7.21-22,24-25; *TADAE* B3.8.21-22,24-25.

band,"[22] which a few passages in the Jerusalem Talmud still view as being sufficiently clear and legally adequate. According to *Ketub.* 5, 10, 30b; 7, 6, 31c, Rabbi Jose says that those who write *'yn śn' 'yn śn't* "(if he hates, if she hates") are making a contractually binding financial agreement. The second text also cites the following passage from a *ketubah* quoted by Maimonides in his *Hilkhot ha-Yerushalmi:* "If a woman hates her spouse and no longer wishes to be his companion, then let her take half of the bridal gift. The confirmation of the existence of legal grounds for divorce ("if a woman hates") is complemented by the explicit mention of a complaint for divorce ("she no longer wishes to be his companion").[23] The same terminology recurs in Cairo Genizah marriage contracts dating to the 10th/11th-century C.E. It makes clear that *śn'* > *sn'* does not mean "divorce," but rather indicates the legal grounds prompting the person in question to get the divorce. The following can serve as an example: "If this Saʿīd, the groom, hates this Malīḥa, does not desire her, and wants to separate from her, he shall pay her all that is written and specified in this marriage contract, . . . completely. And if this Malīḥa hates this Saʿīd, her husband, and desires to leave his home, she shall lose her *ketubba* money . . . and she shall go out."[24] The contracts contain differences that are sometimes merely stylistic in nature.

One contract made at Tinnis (Egypt), for example, uses the syntagma *ysny l* instead of the accusative and refers to the wife as the "lady" *(qryh,* transliteration of Gk. *kýria).*[25] Other contracts often make interesting distinctions. One written in Tyre mentions "gratuitous hatred" *(śn't mgn),* an expression recurring elsewhere in the formula *sn'h d-mgn.*[26] Another contract, also written in Tyre, merely contains a one-sided clause referring to the husband: "but if he hates her without any misconduct (on her part) and does not fulfill her three needs . . . ,"[27] i.e., if he does not fulfill his threefold obligation of caring for the nourishment, clothing, and sexual needs of his wife.

The use of *śn'* in Dt. 22:13,16; 24:3; Mal. 2:16 must be examined in the light of this extrabiblical evidence. The LXX is not helpful, as it consistently translates *śn'* with *miseín,* "hate," without attributing a specific meaning to the verb. Dt. 22:13-21 deals with the damage to the reputation of a young married woman who is "hated" by her husband. The latter tries to emphasize this particular legal ground in his attempt to secure an advantageous divorce by slandering his wife, asserting that she was no longer a virgin at the time of their wedding. If his accusations prove to be false, he may not "send her away" (*šlḥ* piel, v. 19). Here it becomes clear that such "hate" refers not to a simple emotional state, but rather to a whole complex of factors leading to divorce. Dt. 24:3 delineates three stages in the process: "hate" representing the legal ground of di-

22. *AP* 15.23,27; *BMAP* 2.7,9; *TADAE* B2.6.23,27; B3.3.7,9.

23. Moses Maimonides, *Hilkhot ha-Yerushalmi,* ed. Saul Lieberman (New York, 1947); cf. *Ketub.* 7, 6, 31c.

24. Friedman, no. 3:4-7 (vol. I, pp. 328; vol. II, pp. 56); cf. also nos. 1:22-24; 2:31-34; 4:37-39; 6:12-15; 11:18-20; 58:11-12.

25. See ibid., no. 1:22 (vol. II, pp. 9, 13).

26. For the former see ibid., no. 2:32 (vol. II, p. 44); for the latter, no. 6:14.

27. Ibid., no. 11:18-19 (vol. II, p. 135).

vorce, then the preparation and deposition of a bill of divorce establishing the legal status of the divorce whose practical consequence is the woman's dismissal. Thus does "hatred" find its legal satisfaction.

Finally, Mal. 2:16 tersely associates "hate" and "dismissal." This difficult passage has been subject to extremely varying interpretations and often to rather arbitrary emendations. It seems to be alluding to the custom of spreading the edge of a garment over a woman to express one's desire to marry her (Ruth 3:9; Ezk. 16:8; cf. Dt. 23:1[22:30]; 27:20). When a husband expels the wife of his youth, he soils "his garment with violence."

Allusions to divorce are probably also present in Isa. 60:15, which refers to a time when Jerusalem was ruined and abandoned. The poet compares the city to a "hated," probably disowned wife whom "no one passing by" even notices.

Although the OT itself does not use the subst. *śin'â* in connection with divorce, Jewish Aramaic documents from Elephantine use the expressions *ksp šn'h br'šh,* "the money of hate [divorce money] will be on her/his head," *šn'h hy,* "that is hate [she is divorced]," and *dyn šn'h,* "the law of hate [of divorce]," always in connection with divorce proceedings.[28] The formulation *ksp šn'h br'šh* recalls the statement "I hate my wife," "I hate my husband," and shows that the settlement sum for a divorce was paid by the plaintiff. Although *śin'â* refers directly to the legal grounds prompting the divorce, it refers ultimately to the entire process. By contrast, the second expression, *šn'h hy,* says that "there are legal grounds for divorce," referring to specific cases in which a woman was unfaithful to her husband or in which her husband has taken another wife, or that one of the spouses is refusing marital obligations to the other, for example, sexual relations. In this context *šn'h* refers ultimately to circumstances that make someone hateful and basically has the same meaning as *šn'th* in a proverb of Ahiqar: "His hatefulness is the lies of his lips."[29] The third expression, *dyn šn'h,* is one of the clauses indicating that the divorce is being undertaken by referring to the "law of hate."

2. *Murder.* Several texts dealing with cities of asylum use the root *śn'* to qualify the actions of a murderer as premeditated (Nu. 35:20; Dt. 4:42; 19:4,6,11; Josh. 20:5). A murder motivated by blood vengeance is committed *beśin'â,* "with hate" (Nu. 35:20), by "someone who hates his neighbor" (*'îš śōnē' lerē'ēhû,* Dt. 19:11). Cities of asylum, however, are to offer refuge to those who kill "inadvertently" *(bepeṯa'),* "without enmity" *(belō'-'êḇâ),* "without premeditation, without lying in wait" *(belō' ṣeḏîyâ,* Nu. 35:22), "unintentionally" *(biḇelî-ḏa'aṯ),* "without hating him" *(lō'-śōnē' lô;* Dt. 4:42; 19:4,6; Josh. 20:5). This important legal distinction attests the development of ancient Hebrew law, an initial trace of which one finds in Ex. 21:12-14, namely, a distinction between murder and unpremeditated manslaughter by someone who did not lie in wait

28. *AP* 15.23; 18.1; *BMAP* 2.8,9; 7.22,25; 7.34,37,39,40; *TADAE* B2.6.23; B3.3.8,9; B3.8.22, 25,34,37,39,40; B6.4.1.

29. Ahiqar 132; *TADAE* C1.1.132; *ANET,* 429b.

(lō' ṣāḏâ) but still killed because "God let it happen by his hand." This ascription of accidental events to the deity is common to all Semites,[30] and the mention of the "hand" in connection with an unpremeditated crime is also found in the Hittite laws, which use the expression in the formulation "if his hand (alone) is guilty," an expression recurring in the later versions of §§5,7,8. The distinction between intentional and unintentional bodily injury and killing is already fixed in CH §§206-7, which imposes the following oath upon the person involved in involuntary manslaughter: "I did not strike him deliberately *(idû)*." This expression corresponds to *biḇᵉlî-ḏa'aṯ* in Dt. 4:42; 19:4; Josh. 20:5. Such a distinction did not occur in the Laws of Ur-Namma, ca. 2000 B.C.E.: "If someone commits a murder, that person is to be put to death" (§1).

VII. Qumran. God's hatred for those who take the wrong path plays a fairly important role in the Qumran texts. God hates their ways forever (*śānē' lāneṣaḥ,* 1QS 4:1), for he hates iniquity always (*tiśnā' 'awlâ lā'aḏ,* 1QH 14:25). Those who follow the spirit of iniquity have chosen what God hates (*ba'ᵃšer śānē'ṯâ,* 1QH 15:19). They are the "enemies of righteousness" (*mᵉśannᵉ'ê ṣeḏeq,* 1QM 3:5-6), "enemies of God" (*mᵉśannᵉ'ê 'ēl,* 1QM 3:6; 4QM^{f} 12:1), "those whom he hates" (*'ᵃšer śānē',* CD 2:13), and "who hate one another" (*śᵉnô' 'îš 'eṯ rē'ēhû,* CD 8:6; 19:18). They are also characterized as the "builders of the wall," an expression borrowed from Ezk. 13:10 referring perhaps to contemporary circumstances; "because he hated the builders of the wall *(bᵉśonᵉ'ô 'ēṯ bônê haḥayiṣ)* his anger was kindled" (CD 8:18; cf. 19:31). By contrast, those who rise in the spirit of truth will "hate injustice" (*yiśnā' 'awlâ,* 1QS 4:24) and all the works of impurity (*m'śy ndh,* 4Q511 18, II, 17). They should cast off what God hates (*limᵉ'ôs ka'ᵃšer śānē',* CD 2:5), and embrace everything God loves while rejecting everything he hates (1QH 17:24; cf. 14:10-11). The Community Rule is given "that they may love all that he has chosen and hate all that he has rejected" (1QS 1:3-4), and "that they may love all the sons of light . . . and hate all the sons of darkness" (1:9-10). The behavioral norms of the community deal with everything an insightful person needs with regard to "his loving and hating" (*lᵉ'ahᵃḇāṯô 'im śin'āṯô,* 9:21; cf. 9:16). Such a person should nourish "everlasting hatred for the men of perdition" (*śin'aṯ 'ôlām 'im 'anšê šaḥaṯ,* 9:21-22), though one is not permitted to hate a member of the community (*'al yiśnā'ēhû,* 5:26). The terminology employed here uses the parallelism "love/hate" (1:3-4,9-10; 3:25–4:1; 9:16,21; 1QH 14:24-25; 17:24).

Several passages express confidence that God will punish or destroy those who hate Zion (11QPs^{a} 22:11 par. 4QPs^{f} 8:7), his people (4Q160 3-4, II, 4), or the individual believer (4Q381 31, 5; cf. also 46, 5).

The use of *śn'* in the Temple Scroll agrees with that in Deuteronomy. 11QT 52:2 mentions the sacred pillar that God hates (Dt. 16:22), though the 1st person replaces the 3rd person of Moses' discourse in Dtr since God himself is speaking to his people in the Temple Scroll: "the sacred pillar that I hate" *(maṣṣēḇâ 'ᵃšer śānē'ṯî).* Something similar applies to the beneficent deeds promised to the people and the king and in-

30. See CH §§249, 266.

spired by Dt. 28. God declares that "I will redeem them from the hand of those who hate them" (*ûpᵉḏîṯîm mikkap śōnᵉ'eyhēmmâ,* 11QT 59:11). Turning to the king, he says, "I will save him [the king] from the hand of those who hate him" (*wᵉhôšaʿtîhû mîyaḏ śônᵉ'āyw,* 59:18). Only those who hate unjust gain (*ṣônᵉ'ê beṣaʿ,* 57:9) can be members of the royal guard; the same expression is used in Ex. 18:21 and Prov. 28:16 to refer to those who do not accept bribes.

The paragraph referring to the slandered spouse basically follows the text of Dt. 22:13-21 while adding several clarifying expressions. For example, *bā' 'ēleyhā ûśᵉnē'â* in v. 13 is replaced by *bᵉʿālâ ûśᵉnē'â,* "He has taken possession of [married] her and (then) hated her" (11QT 65:7), which is stating that the husband had sexual relations with his wife before coming to hate her. He wants to expel her, however, without having to pay the divorce money (cf. Dt. 22:18-19; 11QT 65:14), but must nonetheless pay if his hatred for his wife proves to be groundless (*śin'aṯ maggān* or *śin'â dᵉ-maggān*), as indicated by the Cairo Genizah documents.[31] The complaint against the slanderer lodged with elders by the wife's father (11QT 65:11) picks up the text of Dt. 22:16, though it replaces *wayyiśnā'ehā* with *wᵉhinnēh śᵉnē'â,* "And behold, he has come to hate her," which constitutes merely a stylistic alteration. It is evident that the vb. *śn'* here does not mean "divorce," and certainly does not in Dt. 22; rather, it stipulates the legal ground that might justify divorce or expulsion. Unfortunately, we do not know the extent to which the text of 11QT 66:1-2 concurs with Dt. 22:19b-21. The two texts were doubtless not identical, since *wᵉlô'* at the end of 11QT 65:15 immediately introduces the clause *wᵉlô' yûḵal lᵉšallᵉḥâ kôl yāmāyw,* "and he will never be able to dismiss her," unless the correct completion of the lacuna in 11QT 66:1 is *wᵉlô' tihyeh lô lᵉ'iššâ,* "and she will no longer be his wife," which agrees with 4Q159 2-4, 9-10. According to this text, a man who unjustly accuses "a virgin of Israel" "shall be fined two minas and divorce for all his life" *(wᵉneʿᵉnaš šᵉnê mānîm wᵉšillaḥ kôl yāmāyw).* The sum of two minas corresponds to the hundred shekels in Dt. 22:19 and 11QT 65:14, and the expression *šlḥ kwl ymyw* picks up words from Dt. 22:19. One could also point *wšlḥ* as pual *wᵉšullaḥ* and interpret it in the sense of being condemned to divorce. Either way, at issue is a husband who has taken a "virgin of Israel" as his wife, as indicated by the expression *qaḥtô 'ôṯâ,* "(when) he took her" (4Q159 2-4, 8), with the vb. *lqḥ,* which is also used in Dt. 22:13-18 and 11QT 65:7-13.

Lipiński

31. Friedman, no. 2:32; 6:14.

שָׂפָה *śāpâ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences: OT, Sirach, Qumran; 3. LXX. II. 1. Lip; Hem, Edge; 2. Organ of Speech; 3. Metonymy: Language, Speech. III. 1. The Speech Act; 2. Religious Aspects; 3. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Apart from the expected phonetic variation (Proto-Semitic *ś* in the initial position), this word occurs with the same meaning, "lip," in other Semitic languages as well as in Egyptian: *Akk. šaptu,* Ugar. *špt,* Old Aramaic *ś/spt'* and *śph,* Syr. *seftā',* Arab. *šafat,* "lip," Egyp. *śp.t.*[1] This word represents an extremely ancient biconsonantal noun with a feminine ending.

The same applies to the Egyptian evidence. The dual *(-ty)* as well as the determinative morpheme in the later language prove the feminine gender. Accordingly, the *t* does not represent a phoneme that originally belonged to the stem and was reconstrued as a sign of the feminine only in the Semitic languages.[2]

The word is subject to similar semantic applications in the diverse languages. On the one hand, in Akkadian, Egyptian, and Aramaic it refers to an edge comparable to lips (e.g., the edge of a vessel, the shore of a river or sea). On the other hand, as the organ of speech it can refer metyonymically to speaking and language.[3] Arabic attests the secondary form *šafā,* "edge."[4]

2. *Occurrences: OT, Sirach, Qumran.* This lexeme occurs 176 times in the OT, of which basically half are found in the Psalms and wisdom writings, which use the term figuratively in the sense of "speech." Although the word is feminine (Gen. 11:1; Zeph. 3:9; etc.), it is often associated with masculine verb forms either because some figurative sense is being evoked (Ex. 28:32) or because the author is thinking of the male person whose lips are being mentioned (Prov. 10:21; 26:23; Mal. 2:7; etc.). Because the feminine ending *t* could be perceived from a linguistic perspective as a third stem consonant, a redundant plural or dual form emerged, *śip̱ṯôṯ, śip̱ṯôṯeyḵā,* and *śip̱ṯôṯāyw* (Ps. 45:3[Eng. 2]; Eccl. 10:12; Cant. 5:13), alongside *śip̱ṯê, śᵉpāṯeyḵā,* and *śᵉpāṯāyw* (Dt. 23:24[23]; Ps. 12:4[3]; Isa. 11:4).[5] In the construct state, the word functions as a *nomen*

śāpâ. D. I. Block, "The Role of Language in Ancient Israelite Perceptions of National Identity," *JBL* 103 (1984) 321-40, esp. 323-32; E. Dhorme, *L'Emploi métaphorique des noms des parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien* (Paris, 1923, repr. 1963), esp. 88-89; C. Uehlinger, *Weltreich und "eine Rede." Eine neue Deutung der sogenannten Turmbauerzählung (Gen 11,1-9). OBO* 101 (1990), esp. 345-50, 406-9; → לשון *lāšôn,* VIII, 23-33.

1. In order: *AHw,* III, 1176; *UT,* no. 2461; *WUS,* no. 2663; cf. *DNSI,* II, 1181; *LexSyr,* 489; *BDB,* 973; cf. *HAL,* III, 1346-47.

2. Contra *VG,* I, 332.

3. *AHw,* III, 1176; *WbÄS,* IV, 99-100; *LexÄg,* III, 1056-57; Jastrow, 1613-14.

4. *BDB,* 973.

5. See *BLe,* §§74i', 77t.

rectum with words referring to something produced by the lips (e.g., Nu. 30:13[12]), though more often it is the *nomen regens* with the following word often specifying more closely the character of the "lip," i.e., of speech; examples include "lips of truthfulness (righteous lips)," "lips of falsehood (lying lips)" (Ps. 31:19[18]; Prov. 16:13) in reference to sincere or mendacious speech.

In Hebrew Sirach the word occurs only in the figurative sense of "speech." The same applies to most of the Qumran writings.[6] Only the War Scroll (1QM 5:5,7-8) uses the word to refer to the gold and silver "edge" of the shield and the spear socket.

3. *LXX.* Even when the word is being used figuratively, the LXX generally translates it with the standard lexeme for "lip," *cheílos.* Since in Greek this word also refers to the "edge, shore," and similar concepts, LXX translations contain a Hebraism only when, as in, e.g., Gen. 11:1,6,9, the word refers to "language, speaking."[7] Indeed, some passages use the word *glṓssa* instead (Ps. 81:6[5][LXX 80:6]; Prov. 17:4; Isa. 19:18; Zeph. 3:9). In one instance the LXX translates *śāpâ* as *lógos:* in reference to flattery as "sweetness of lips" (Prov. 16:21). In Gen. 11:7 *śāpâ* stands after the vb. *šāma',* "hear," in the sense of "understand a language"; here the LXX uses *phōnḗ,* "(hear) a voice," in the literal sense. With the meaning "shore," the LXX once translates *śāpâ* as *méros* (Josh. 12:2), whereas in another passage where the Hebrew text reads *'al yaḏ,* "next to, at the (river)," the LXX translates *epí toú cheílous* (Dnl. 10:4). This understanding may derive from the reading *'al śᵉpaṯ (hannāhār).*[8]

II. 1. *Lip; Hem, Edge.* The term *śāpâ* referred originally to the fleshy edge of the mouth, the "lip," and as such stands in a certain contiguous relationship with the other parts of the body, especially those of the mouth area. Hence the descriptive song in Cant. 4:1-7 extols the beauty of the bride's eyes, hair, teeth, mouth, and "lips like a crimson thread" (v. 3). The lover tells his bride, "your lips distill nectar . . . honey and milk are under your tongue" (v. 11). In her own turn, the bride extols the beauty of his head, eyes, teeth,[9] cheeks, and "his lips . . . lilies distilling liquid myrrh" (5:13). Good wine moistens the lips. The *śāpâ* is also like the "flews of a hound." Yahweh threatens an Assyrian king whom he compares to an animal: "I will put a hook in your nose and my bit in your lips *(biśᵉpāṯeyḵā)*" (2 K. 19:28 [= Isa. 37:29]). The pack of dogs — a metaphor for one's enemies — slavers with their mouths and has sharp flews (Ps. 59:8[7]). The venom of vipers is under the enemy's lips (Ps. 140:4[3]). In the mythologically colored theophany of Yahweh in judgment upon his enemies, we read that "his lips are full of indignation, and his tongue is like a devouring fire" (Isa. 30:27).

Together with other parts of the face, lips express a person's mood and reactions to various events. At the sight of a suffering person, scoffing spectators grimace with their

6. See III.3 below.
7. See S. C. Schirlitz, *Grundzüge der neutestamentlichen Gräcität* (Giessen, 1861), 32.
8. On the exchangeability of "mouth" and "lip," see II.2 below.
9. See H. Ringgren, *Das Hohelied. ATD* 16/2 (³1981), 276.

lips and shake their heads (Ps. 22:8[7]). When the person planning a wicked deed squints his eyes and lips together, the deed is as good as done (Prov. 16:30).

A kiss on the lips evokes goodwill (Prov. 24:26). This context might also include the — albeit insincere — friendship kiss when it is delivered with "burning lips" (26:23), though the text (which is uncertain) might rather refer to a spoken asseveration of friendship.

The obvious function of the lips in surrounding the mouth opening makes it possible to use the word *śāpâ* figuratively in the sense of "hem, edge." The curtains in the tabernacle have such edges (Ex. 26:4,10; 36:11,17), as does the breastpiece (28:26; 39:19) and outer robe (28:32; 39:23) of the priestly vestments. One also encounters such an edge, similar to an artistically decorated edge of a goblet, on the huge bronze vessel in the temple forecourt, which measured ten cubits "from brim to brim," i.e., in diameter (1 K. 7:23-24; 2 Ch. 4:2,5), on the altar in the future temple (Ezk. 43:13), and on the copper shields of the sons of light in the Qumran War Scroll (1QM 5:5,7-8).

The word can also refer to the "bank of a river" or other body of water, e.g., to the bank of the Nile (Gen. 41:3,17; Ex. 2:3; 7:15), of the Arnon (Dt. 2:36; 4:48; Josh. 12:2; 13:9,16), of the Jordan (2 K. 2:13), of a stream (Dnl. 12:5), and of the powerful stream rising up next to the new temple of the end time (Ezk. 47:6-7,12).

The hostile Midianites flee to the *śāpâ* of Abel-meholah (Jgs. 7:22), a possible reference to an area bordering the locale, though it seems more likely that it would be referring to the bank of a brook somewhere in the vicinity (Abel = "watercourse"?).

The word also refers to the shore of a sea, e.g., of the sea where the Egyptians died (Ex. 14:30) and of the Red Sea, where Ezion-geber and Eloth are located (1 K. 9:26; 2 Ch. 8:17). The hyperbole "as the sand on the seashore" describes an enormous number of people (Gen. 22:17; Josh. 11:4; Jgs. 7:12; 1 S. 13:5); in one instance it also refers to the measure of great wisdom, "breadth of understanding as vast as the sand on the seashore" (1 K. 5:9[14:29]).

2. *Organ of Speech.* Because the lips function in an especially noticeable way in producing sounds, they are often described as the preeminent organ of sound production. The lips of someone scared to death quiver (Hab. 3:16). The lips of the rescued person are filled with shouts of joy (Job 8:21). Above all, however, lips function to articulate the sounds of speech, which can thus be viewed as the "fruit of the lips" (Isa. 57:18; probably also Hos. 14:3[2]; cf. LXX and 1QH 1:29). Lips move when a person is speaking or even whispering softly (1 S. 1:13), whence also *śāpâ* comes to refer to the human ability to speak and is equated with a person's reasoning powers (Job 12:20). Those who speak awkwardly are "uncircumcised of lips" (Ex. 6:12,30), a reference not to a moral or religious defect but to awkward speech, which makes Moses unsuitable for his task (cf. Ex. 4:10). It is noteworthy that in describing the impression made by the organs of speech of an unskilled speaker, authors describe the mouth and tongue as being "heavy" and the lips as "having a foreskin."

When *śāpâ* refers metonymically to "speech," the lexeme enters into extremely tight paradigmatic-semantic relationships with designations for other instruments of speech that experienced a similar semantic expansion, such as "mouth," "tongue," and

"gums" (*ḥēḵ*).[10] In many contexts these words can replace one another or be used interchangeably within *parallelismus membrorum.* Mendacious speech can thus be called a "lying tongue" (e.g., Prov. 21:6) or "lying lips" (Ps. 120:2; Prov. 17:7), "deceitful tongue" (Ps. 52:6[4]) or "deceitful lips" (Ps. 17:1). Flattery comes from a "smooth mouth" (Prov. 26:28) and "smooth lips" (Ps. 12:4[3]). The "mouth" (Prov. 22:14) and "lips" (Prov. 5:3) of the strange woman are enticing, while the "mouth of the righteous" (Ps. 37:30) and the "lips of the righteous" (Prov. 10:21,32) are blessed. Parallelism can use *śāpâ* in the first stich, *peh* in the second (Job 23:12; Ps. 66:14; Prov. 16:10), though generally the sequence is reversed (Job 15:6; Ps. 59:8,13[7,12]; 141:3; Prov. 13:3; 16:23; etc.). The semantic similarity between these words made it possible for the LXX to translate *peh* as "lip" (Prov. 6:2) and *śāpâ* as "mouth" (Job 27:4; Ezk. 24:22) or "tongue" (Sir. 51:22). The contiguous relationship between the two is obvious (Isa. 6:7; 29:13).

Nonetheless, even without closer componential analysis, specific semantic characteristics do emerge in the case of *śāpâ*. It may be merely accidental that, unlike the tongue (Isa. 59:3), mouth (Ps. 37:30), gums, and palate (Prov. 8:7), the lips are never associated with the vb. *hgh,* "mumble, murmur, grumble," and that the adj. *'āmēq,* "profound, unfathomable," as a reference to unintelligible language is used only with *śāpâ* (Isa. 33:19; Ezk. 3:5,6). It is no accident, however, that the lips, as the externally visible closure of the mouth, are viewed as the final stage along the path from thought to speech. On the one hand, the lips thus fulfill an important function of control; on the other, the danger is that they will not always perform that function adequately.

Lips must open if the mouth is to speak (Ps. 51:17[15]; 66:14). Because those who would make a proclamation cannot keep their lips closed (Ps. 40:10[9]), the opening of one's lips comes to be equated with speaking (Job 11:5; 32:20; Prov. 8:6). If things go well, the lips will guard knowledge (Prov. 5:2; Mal. 2:7) and thus preserve the wise (14:3). The teachings of wisdom preserved deep within should be ready on the lips (22:18). Unfortunately, the opposite is often the case, and the lips utter things without first reflecting on them (Jer. 17:16), such as a careless oath (Nu. 30:13[12]), a "thoughtless utterance of the lips" (vv. 7,9[6,8]) that can no longer be undone. With regard to vows, the law admonishes that "whatever your lips utter you must diligently perform" (Dt. 23:24[23]). At the waters of Meribah, even Moses "spoke rashly with his lips" because of the recalcitrant people (Ps. 106:33), and it thus "went ill with Moses" (v. 32). Hence one should avoid those who are "open as to their lips" (Prov. 20:19); those who are restrained with their lips are prudent (Prov. 10:19).

Thus one often noticeable semantic component associated with "lips" is careless babbling. In a dispute some people choose the "tongue of the crafty," a metaphor for skilled argumentation. Their own lips, however, with their careless utterances, testify against them and reveal their injustice (Job 15:5-6). A man of violence is a man of the tongue (Ps. 140:12[11]), and the babbler is a man of the lips (Job 11:2).

---

10. → פה *peh,* XI, 490-503; → לשון *lāšôn,* VIII, 23-33.

3. *Metonymy: Language, Speech.* Given the close connection between the instrument of speech and its product, the Hebrew word for "lip" can also refer metonymically to "spoken words, speech," and given the literary character and general themes of OT writings, it is not surprising that the word is more frequently used with precisely this meaning than as a reference to the physical organ. When a speech act takes place and the person speaking can be observed, attention is generally focused on the content of the utterance, i.e., on the intent of the speech. An encounter with a foreign language, on the other hand, prompts attention to be directed to the formal side as well, a situation explaining the — albeit infrequent — use of the Hebrew word to refer to a "dialect, language system."

Hence the prophet can speak of five cities in Egypt that speak the *śāpâ* of Canaan (Isa. 19:18), a reference that can hardly be understood to mean anything but Hebrew (though cf. Jerome and his comm. in loc., who views Canaanite as an idiom between Hebrew and Egyptian). The story of the tower of Babel presupposes an original, unified human language. All people "had one *śāpâ* and the same words" (Gen. 11:1). If this passage were employing the stylistic figure of a harmonious association of synonyms, then both words would refer to vocabulary. It seems more likely, however, that a distinction is being made in that *śāpâ* refers to the overall language structure quite beyond merely the vocabulary.

This one language makes human beings into a single people (Gen. 11:6) whose emerging arrogance is then punished by a confusion of this language, i.e., by its schism (vv. 7-9), such that they no longer understand one another's *śāpâ* (v. 7). The psalmist recounts in connection with Egypt how he heard a *śāpâ* he had not hitherto known (Ps. 81:6[5]); although scholars dispute whether the reference is to divine discourse that comes to the prophet or to Israel in Egypt, the term "lip" does in any case mean "language" here. The prophets mention strange peoples "of obscure lips" (Isa. 33:19; Ezk. 3:5,6). God will speak to Israel with "stammering lip and with alien tongue," probably a reference to the enemies God sends as his scourge (Isa. 28:11). In the end time, God will give all peoples a pure language (Zeph. 3:9).[11]

When "lip" refers to the elocutionary component of speech, i.e., to its content, a distinction is generally made between the one-time speech act executed in a specific situational context on the one hand, and on the other hand the manner of speaking characteristic of a given person that allows one to draw conclusions concerning the person's disposition and behavior. Textual analysis, however, is not always able to draw this distinction clearly.

A one-time speech act is the focus in the passages speaking about rash utterances (Lev. 5:4; Nu. 30:7,9,13[6,8,12]; Ps. 106:33) and about words of comfort spoken to the grieving ("solace of my lips," Job 16:5). This context also includes the unsolicited witness in which "you could deceive with your lips" (Prov. 24:28) and the self-accusation in which "your own mouth condemns you . . . your own lips testify against you" (Job 15:6). It is difficult to determine whether the enemies' daily accusations, the "lips of

11. See III.2 below.

the adversaries" (Lam. 3:62), refer to ever new reproaches from those adversaries or to their hateful attitude in general as manifested in, among other things, stereotypical inflammatory speech. The lips bless the generous host (Sir. 34:23), a reference either to a one-time word of thanks or to a high estimation of the host.

It is merely a stylistic nuance when the lips themselves are designated as that which produces speech rather than the speaker himself with the help of lips. Saying "my lips will praise you" (Ps. 63:4[3]) and "thoughtless utterances of her lips" (Nu. 30:7[6]) is essentially the same as saying "with my lips I declare all the ordinances" (Ps. 119:13) or "utter with the lips" (Lev. 5:4), etc. Although one might be inclined to understand the strife-prone lips of the fool (Prov. 18:6) as a reference to the involuntary activity of lips not controlled by the speaker, the statement "the lips of the wise spread knowledge" (Prov. 15:7) militates against this view, since here the lips obviously receive their instructions from the understanding.

III. 1. *The Speech Act.* A person's speech provides clues regarding intelligence, character, and behavior. "On the lips of one who has understanding wisdom is found" (Prov. 10:13), whereas *'ᵉwîl śᵉpāṯayim* (lit. "a fool of the lips") "will come to ruin" (vv. 8,10). Hence silence is often advisable. When fools keep silent, they may be considered wise; when they close their lips, they may be deemed intelligent (17:28). "Lips that speak what is right" (23:16) belong to the honest person, and "no wrong is found on his lips" (Mal. 2:6). "Lying lips" (Prov. 10:18), "deceit of the lips" (Prov. 4:24), and "flattering lips" (Ps. 12:3-4[2-3]) are found among the wicked, who wreak havoc with their lips (Prov. 17:4; 24:2). "False lips" are not becoming to a noble person (17:7). People find it difficult, however, to overcome their egocentric perspectives, prompting most of them to declare their own lips free of falsehood (Job 27:4) while finding only lies and deceit among their adversaries, particularly when they are pleading for God's help. The petitioner believes he is being persecuted by the wicked, whose lying lips he would like to see silenced (Ps. 31:19[18]). His enemies have the venom of vipers under their lips (140:4[3]). Israel itself is threatened by hostile nations with sharp swords on their lips (59:8[7]), while the "words of their lips" (v. 13[12]) consist of cursing and lies.

Wisdom instruction also incorporates both intellectual estimation and utilitarian considerations. To give an honest answer is like a "kiss on the lips" (Prov. 24:26). Pleasant speech, "sweetness of the lips" (16:21), enriches instruction. The understanding of the wise adds persuasiveness to their lips (v. 23). "Lips informed by knowledge" (20:15) are a precious jewel. Wise speech is announced by the combination of *da'aṯ,* "knowledge, insight," and "lips" (14:7; 15:7; Mal. 2:7). Those who have a pure heart and the capacity for gracious speech ("graciousness of the lips," Prov. 22:11) can become the friend to kings. "Lips of graciousness" bring peace (Sir. 6:5). Lips of righteousness and honest speech delight kings (Prov. 16:13). The goal of instruction is for students to have a wise heart and lips that they may "speak what is right" (23:16). Wisdom speaks the truth, and "from my lips will come what is right" (8:6-7). By contrast, those whose lips are perverse are fools (19:1; concerning the text see *BHS*), and whereas the lips of the wise spread knowledge, the minds of fools are not honest

(15:7). The "transgressions of their lips" do not help the wicked, becoming instead a snare for them (12:13); their lips are a snare to themselves (18:7). The lips of fools consume them (Eccl. 10:12). While wisdom is found on the lips of those with understanding, the fool's mouth brings ruin (Prov. 10:13-14). "A fool's lips bring strife, and a fool's mouth invites a flogging" (18:6).

A certain power is thought to inhere in the *śāpâ* as the bearer of speech. The spoken word not only has immediately observable consequences in human life, but according to the view of antiquity also possesses magical power. The mind of the wicked devises violent deeds, and their lips speak of the mischief (Prov. 24:2). The schemer compresses his lips and the wicked deed is as good as done (16:30). An inner desire is equated with the request of the lips (Ps. 21:3[2]).

Grace is poured over the lips of the king (Ps. 45:3[2]); inspired decisions are on his lips, and "his mouth does not sin in judgment" (Prov. 16:10). The ruler of the salvific period will kill the wicked "with the breath of his lips" (Isa. 11:4).

The power of speech, however, is also engaged on behalf of wickedness. The wicked say, "Our lips are our own — who is our master?" (Ps. 12:5[4]). Although the strength of the lips presupposed here may refer to the power to command, it may also refer to the power of magical imprecations.[12] The strange woman seduces with the smoothness of her lips (Prov. 7:21); honey drips from her lips (Prov. 5:3). Although elsewhere the latter expression refers to the physical game of love (Cant. 4:11; 5:13), in this context it refers to the beguiling words of the seductress, words that sound sweet but whose inevitable consequences are bitter and lethal (Prov. 7:23). Jewish and Christian exegetes spiritualized this idiom to the point of allegory, understanding the honey-sweet lips of the strange woman as a reference to heretical teaching.[13]

Witnesses, too, can beguile with their lips (Prov. 24:28), and a person can sin with the lips (Job 2:10). In a general sense the "yield of the lips brings satisfaction" to a person (Prov. 18:20), i.e., a person must deal with both the good and the bad consequences of speech.

Nonetheless, respect for the lips was by no means without its limits. Critical observation showed that a discrepancy often obtained between words and reality, that speakers often did not act according to their words if their speech served to disguise their true disposition or their real actions.

Empty talk is bad. Laborious toil creates profit, while "mere talk leads only to poverty" (Prov. 14:23). Mere words ("of the lips") do not supply strategy or power for war (2 K. 18:20 = Isa. 36:5). Although a blizzard of words shows a person to be a "man of the lips," it does not generate credibility (Job 11:2). In general, constant babble invariably leads to trouble, while "the prudent are restrained in their lips" (Prov. 10:19). Things get even worse when an enemy dissembles intentions with the lips while inwardly planning deceit (Prov. 26:24), or offers comfort with the lips while already

---

12. See S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (Eng. trans., Nashville, 1962), 199-200.

13. Jerome, *Comm. on Ezekiel,* 6.14; Rashi, in loc.

planning to trap the unwary in a pit (Sir. 12:16), or when "burning lips" or asseverations or kisses of friendship cover an evil heart (Prov. 26:23). People deceive each other "with flattering lips and a double heart" (Ps. 12:3[2]). People even speak dishonestly to God with their lips. "Yahweh said: Because these people draw near with their mouths and honor me with their lips, while their hearts are far from me . . ." (Isa. 29:13).

2. *Religious Aspects.* It is Yahweh who gives human beings the capacity for speech. Yahweh is the "creator of the fruit of the lips" (Isa. 57:19) and knows "what comes from my lips" (Jer. 17:16). Yahweh grants successful lips to those who sincerely seek wisdom (Sir. 51:22), whereas "lying lips are an abomination to Yahweh" (Prov. 12:22), and the sins separating God and his people include not only hands defiled with blood but also lips that have spoken lies (Isa. 59:3).

People's sinfulness also manifests itself in their "unclean lips," which is why the atonement ritual must be carried out on such lips before they can participate in a consecrated task (Isa. 6:5ff.) or encounter a celestial being (Dnl. 10:16). Those who fear God keep their lips from speaking deceit (Ps. 34:14[13]) and ask Yahweh to "keep watch over the door of my lips" (141:3). Those whose lips are free from deceit can petition God for a hearing (17:1); they intend to fulfill all the vows their lips have uttered (66:13-14) and do not take the names of foreign gods upon their lips (16:4). Petitioners ask God to open their lips that they might praise Yahweh (51:17[15]). One petitioner says that because God's steadfast love is better than life itself, "my lips will praise you" (63:4[3]); they are lips of joy (v. 6[5]), lips that will shout for joy when the petitioner sings praises to Yahweh (71:23). Because Yahweh has taught the psalmist his statutes, the psalmist's lips will "pour forth praise" (119:171). With those lips, the psalmist has declared all of Yahweh's ordinances (119:13). In order to proclaim Yahweh's steadfast love before the great congregation, the psalmist has not restrained his lips (40:10[9]). In his petition the psalmist asks that God destroy all flattering lips and boasting tongues (12:4[3]) and cause the mischievous lips of his adversaries to overwhelm them (140:10[9]), thereby delivering the petitioner from "lying lips" (120:2). The petitioner then offers thanks for having been delivered from "lips that fabricate lies" and "lips of abominable deeds" (Sir. 51:2,5).

Special grace resides on those called to sacred office. The postexilic period views the priesthood of the earlier period favorably, saying that true torah instruction could be heard from the mouth of the priests from the house of Levi, Yahweh's messenger; their lips guarded knowledge, and no wrong was found on them (Mal. 2:6-7). Aaron's lips pronounced the blessing of Yahweh (Sir. 50:20). Grace was poured out upon the lips of the king (Ps. 45:3[2]); Yahweh did not withhold "the request of his lips" (21:3[2]). The divine promise to the house of David states that "I will not violate my covenant, or alter the word that went forth from my lips" (89:35[34]). The laws come from God; they are the "commandments of his lips" (Job 23:12). The believer guards this "word of your lips" (Ps. 17:4).

In a universalistic look at the end time, the prophet proclaims that Yahweh will

change the speech of the peoples to "a pure lip," i.e., either to a universally comprehensible language or to purified speech that they may all call on the name of Yahweh (Zeph. 3:9).[14]

3. *Qumran.* Several of the 35 occurrences of *śāpâ* in the Qumran texts cite or otherwise refer to biblical verses in which the word occurs. God created the "fruit of the lips" (cf. Hos. 14:3 LXX, Pesh.) even before the lips themselves and precisely fixed the "flow of the breath from the lips" (1QH 1:28-29), i.e., established their function from the very outset. He supplied the "uncircumcised lips" (cf. Ex. 6:12) of the believing petitioner with a ready reply to the wicked (1QH 2:7). The Damascus Document admonishes members to adhere to one's vows by saying, "you shall keep what your lips uttered" (CD 16:6-7; Dt. 23:24; cf. 11QT 53:13). The petitioner asks that lying lips be silenced (1QH 7:11-12; cf. Ps. 31:19[18]).

The petitioner argues against the smooth-talking beguilers who with "lips of uncircumcision and a foreign tongue" pervert the people's reason and understanding, thus leading them astray (1QH 2:17ff.; cf. 4QpNah 2:8). The lying prophets speak to the people "with strange lips and an alien tongue" (1QH 4:16). The petitioner himself has become the target of "slander on the lips of the fierce" (2:11), who have mocked him with "wicked lips" (5:24).

In the Community Rule the wise teacher says that "no cunning or lies shall be found on my lips" (1QS 10:23) and that he "will cause vanities to cease from my lips" (v. 25). This text calls thanksgiving to God "the pipe of my lips," "the portion of my lips" (10:7-8), and "the offering of the lips" (9:4-5,26; 10:6,14; cf. 4Q511 63-64, II, 4). In the Thanksgiving Hymns one exhausted hymnist laments that his lips have gone completely silent (1QH 8:36), while another asks for "circumcision of the lips" (11:5) so that he may proclaim God's mercies.

The believer is certain that nothing unrighteous has come from his lips (4Q511 18, II, 5; 63-64, II, 4), and that through God's grace only praise is on them (1QH 11:5; 4Q511 63, III, 1). He is familiar with both the judging (1QSb 3:27; 5:24; cf. 4Q401 14, II, 8, *lmwṣ' śpty mlk*) and the creating (4Q403 1, I, 35) power of speech (*mzl* or *mwṣ'*) as well as with its unbearable nature (4QM[a] 11, I, 17) and with how no nation holds to it (1Q27 1, I, 10).

Kedar-Kopfstein

14. See *HAL,* I, 162-63.

שַׂק śaq

Contents: I. General Considerations. II. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Material, Cloth; 3. Containers; 4. Mourning and Penitential Garments; 5. Individual Cases. III. LXX.

I. General Considerations. The term *śaq* is one of the nouns with a doubled final consonant and *a* as the stem vowel. No verbal root *śqq* is attested. The word occurs as a primary noun in most of the Semitic languages (though not in Ugaritic or Arabic). Derivation from Akkadian, possibly even from the pre-Semitic period, is possible, whereas derivation from Egyptian is improbable, since the word is not common in Egyptian and is not well attested until Coptic.[1]

The semantic variants of Heb. *śaq,* "(coarse) cloth," "cloth container, sack," "mourning and penitential garment," are essentially the same as those found in Akkadian, where use of the *s/šaqqu(m)* for mourning rites, to the extent such is attested in Akkadian texts, seems to refer to the Western Semitic sphere rather than to Mesopotamia proper.[2]

II. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* The word *śaq* occurs 48 times in the OT and is distributed over the entire OT, from the story of Joseph to Esther and Daniel. Although these occurrences largely involve narrative passages, *śaq* also occurs in prophetic oracles, the Psalms, and in one priestly regulation regarding purity (Lev. 11:32). Apart from Job 16:15, which resembles more the environment of lament in the Psalms, *śaq* does not occur in the wisdom writings. Hence *śaq* represents a word from daily life not specifically associated with a certain era. Extrabiblical evidence is found in several Imperial Aramaic texts corresponding to OT usage.[3]

śaq. I. Benziger, *Hebräische Archäologie* (Leipzig, ^{3}1927), 72-89, esp. 75-76; G. Dalman, *AuS,* V; H. J. Elhorst, "Die israelitischen Trauerriten," *Studien zur semitischen Philologie und Religionsgeschichte. FS J. Wellhausen. BZAW* 27 (1914), 115-28; G. Fohrer, "Sack," *BHHW,* III, 1638; P. Heinische, *Die Trauergebräuche bei den Israeliten. BZfr* 13/7-8 (1931); H. W. Hönig, "Die Bekleidung des Hebräers" (diss., Zurich, 1957), esp. 102-11; E. Kutsch, "'Trauerbräuche' und 'Selbstminderungsriten' im AT," in K. Lüthi, E. Kutsch, and W. Dantine, *Drei Wiener Antrittsreden. ThS* 78 (1965), 23-42 = E. Kutsch, *Kleine Schriften zum AT. BZAW* 168 (1986), 78-95; C. J. Pfeifer, "Sackcloth and Ashes: Jonah 3:6-8," *TBT* 21 (1983) 386-87; F. Schwally, "Miscellan A. 4) שַׂק," *ZAW* 11 (1891) 173-75; G. Stählin, "σάκκος," *TDNT,* VII, 56-64; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 59; H. Weippert, "Kleidung," *BRL*^{2}, 185-88.

1. On Akkadian see E. Schrader, H. Zimmern, and H. Winckler, *Die Keilinschriften und das AT* (Berlin, ^{3}1903), 603, 650; H. Zimmern, *Akkadische Fremdwörter als Beweis für babylonischen Kultureinfluss* (Leipzig, ^{2}1917), 67. On pre-Semitic see von Soden, *AHw,* II, 1027. On Egyptian see Schwally, 174. On Coptic see W. E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford, 1939), 325.

2. *AHw,* II, 1027; *CAD,* XV, 168-69. Cf. *TGI,* 56; cf. also the many recent witnesses from Mari.

3. *DNSI,* II, 1185-86.

2. *Material, Cloth.* First of all, *śaq* refers to a rough, coarse material or cloth woven from goat hair (later also camel hair)[4] and thus black. It was used for various purposes. According to 2 S. 21:10, Rizpah spread a piece of sackcloth on a rock to sit on when she was protecting the corpses of the executed Saulides from birds and wild animals on the heights of Gibeon. Here the *śaq* serves as a pad or mat[5] rather than as a bed, since the continuation makes clear that the woman's desperate struggle to maintain the integrity of the corpses — through which she apparently thwarted an intended pagan rain ritual — lasted day and night. Isa. 3:24 announces to Jerusalem's women that instead of the current luxury clothing, they will soon be wearing garments of coarse *śaq* cloth. In both these passages the use of *śaq* as a garment associated with mourning or repentance seems to resonate at least to a certain extent, since in both cases grievous disaster precedes the use of the *śaq*. In 2 S. 21:10, however, the *śaq* is not really used as a garment; and Isa. 3:24, where indeed the *śaq* is used as such and where an association with mourning rites is present (cf. *ḥgr* and the mention of "baldness"[6]), emphasizes not the actual wearing of the *śaq* but rather the contrast between present splendor and future shabbiness.

The priestly purity regulation in Lev. 11:32 stipulates that any object of daily life will become unclean if a dead, unclean small animal comes into contact with it. Here *śaq,* alongside articles of "wood," "cloth," and "skin," refers to the material from which similar objects are made, especially containers made from this coarse material.

3. *Containers.* Containers made from coarse *śaq* material, corresponding to our "sacks," are mentioned especially in the Joseph story (Gen. 42:25,27,35). The presupposition here is probably that the grain for which Joseph's brothers had come to Egypt was packed into these "sacks" (v. 25). They also contain donkey fodder (v. 27) as well as the purchase money Joseph secretly gives back to them (vv. 25,35). The *'amtaḥaṯ,* which occurs only in the story of Joseph (42:27-28; 43:12,18,21-23; 44:1,2,8,11-12), is used synonymously with *śaq* in v. 27. These, along with other observations (e.g., the doublet v. 27 par. v. 35; the repetition of 42:27 in 43:21 twice uses *'amtaḥaṯ,* which together with the LXX suggests that *śaq* was probably not originally present in 42:27), provide (persuasive) data for distinguishing between sources in this passage (J: *'amtaḥaṯ;* E: *śaq*).[7]

When in Josh. 9:4 the Gibeonites pretend they have come from afar by using old, worn-out *śaqqîm* for their donkeys, the reference is doubtless to containers or provision sacks carried by the donkeys of the sort still used in the Near East.

4. *Mourning and Penitential Garments.* The majority of occurrences refers to the use of the *śaq* as a mourning or penitential garment worn either after or in anticipation

---

4. *AuS,* V, 18, 175-76.

5. See *Aus,* V, 31.

6. See in this regard, H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), in loc.

7. Cf. L. Ruppert, *Die Josepherzählung in der Genesis. SANT* 11 (1965), 97-98; L. Schmidt, *Literarische Studien zur Josephsgeschichte. BZAW* 167 (1986), 135-36, 155-58; a different position is taken, e.g., by C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1986), 112.

of a disastrous event. As a rule, the reference is probably to a loincloth of coarse *śaq* cloth worn about the hips (with *moṯnayim,* Gen. 37:34; 1 K. 20:31-32; Isa. 20:2; Jer. 48:37; Am. 8:10) and cinched with a belt (hence with → חגר *ḥgr,* 2 S. 3:31; 1 K. 20:32; Isa. 15:3; 22:12; Jer. 4:8; 6:26; 49:3; Lam. 2:10; Ezk. 7:18; 27:31; Joel 1:8), whence also the act of taking it off is described with *ptḥ,* i.e., as an opening of the belt (Ps. 30:12[Eng. 11]; Isa. 20:2). It was worn against the bare skin (*'al-bāśār,* 1 K. 21:27; 2 K. 6:30) and was not taken off at night (1 K. 21:27; Joel 1:13). The wearing of this rough, hard, scratchy, scraping piece of cloth represented an element of self-abasement that in its own turn was part of a larger ensemble of mourning and penitential rites through which people responded to the death of a relative or friend or to past or imminent disastrous events.

The life situation surrounding this use is probably best illustrated by Gen. 37:32-35. The father receives proof that his son is probably dead, rends his own garments, puts on the *śaq,* mourns (*'bl* hithpael), and weeps. This sequence corresponds almost exactly to the mourning ceremony David orders and himself follows after the murder of Abner in 2 S. 3:31-32: tearing of garments, putting on the *śaq,* conducting a lament *(spd),* and weeping. The wearing of the *śaq* is associated with these ritual acts in several other passages as well: tearing of garments (1 K. 21:27; 2 K. 19:1 par. Isa. 37:1; Est. 4:1; cf. 2 K. 6:30, where the tearing of garments on the part of those who are present shows that the king is already wearing the *śaq*),[8] mourning and lament (*'ēḇel,* Est. 4:3; Ps. 35:14; Jer. 6:26; Am. 8:10; *spd,* Jer. 4:8; 49:3; Joel 1:13; *mispēḏ,* Est. 4:3; Ps. 30:12[11]; Isa. 22:12; Jer. 6:26; Ezk. 27:31), weeping (*bkh,* Ps. 69:11[10]; *beḵî,* Est. 4:3; Job 16:16; Isa. 15:3; 22:12). This collocation probably represents a fixed mourning rite.

Other acts of sorrow, self-humiliation, and self-abasement are also associated with wearing a *śaq,* such as crying out (*z'q,* Est. 4:1; Ezk. 27:30; Joel 1:14; *ṣ'q,* Jer. 49:3) and wailing (*yll* hiphil, Isa. 15:2-3; Jer. 4:8; 49:3; Joel 1:13), shaving one's head bald (Isa. 15:2 par. Jer. 48:37; Isa. 22:12; Ezk. 7:18; 27:31; Am. 8:10), shaving the beard (Isa. 15:2 par. Jer. 48:37), cutting gashes into one's hands (Jer. 48:37; cf. 49:3, emended text), sprinkling ash or dust on one's head (Neh. 9:1; Lam. 2:10; Ezk. 27:30; cf. Job 16:15), sitting, lying, or writhing on the ground (*'ēper,* Est. 4:1,3; Isa. 58:5; Jer. 6:26; Ezk. 27:30; Dnl. 9:3; Jon. 3:6), singing dirges (Ezk. 27:32; Am. 8:10), and praying (Ps. 35:13; Dnl. 9:3; cf. Jon. 3:8). Many passages mention wearing the *śaq* in connection with fasting or a day of fasting (1 K. 21:27; Neh. 9:1; Est. 4:3; Ps. 35:13; 69:11[10]; Isa. 58:5; Dnl. 9:3; Joel 1:14; Jon. 3:5).[9] The number and varieties of ritual acts seem to increase the more recent the text.

In many cases putting on the *śaq* as in Gen. 37:34 and 2 S. 3:31 (Jer. 6:26; Am. 8:10; and Joel 1:8 presuppose similar cases in the domestic sphere) is a reaction to a catastrophe that has already happened; also in Isa. 15:2 par. Jer. 48:37 as a reaction to the mili-

---

8. → קרע *qāra',* XIII, 175-80.

9. → צום *ṣûm,* XII, 297-301. Cf. T. Podella, *Sôm-Fasten. Kollektive Trauer um den verborgenen Gott im AT. AOAT* 224 (1989), esp. 13-15.

tary decimation of Moab (regardless of whether the basic text of Isa. 15:1ff. is to be understood as a lament over the invasion that has already occurred or as a prophetic anticipation of such); in Ezk. 27:31 as a reaction to the fall of Tyre; in Lam. 2:10 as a reaction to the conquest and destruction of Jerusalem in 587; and in Est. 4:1-4 as a reaction to Haman's pogrom decree. Ezk. 7:18 portrays the reactions of those overtaken by Yahweh's judgment, albeit not as an "active effort to action," but rather as the "outward powerlessness and defenselessness of those concerned in the judgment."[10] In 1 K. 20:31-32 putting on the *śaq* is a reaction to the terrible defeat the Arameans suffered at the hands of Israel. When Ben-hadad's servants appear before the king of Israel with *śaqqîm* around their waists and ropes on their heads (the latter attested only in this passage), they do so as a sign of subordination and self-submission accompanying the plea for the life of their king, Ben-hadad. Finally, in the lament against adversaries in Ps. 35:13, the psalmist insists on his own innocence by referring to how he reacted to his adversaries' own sickness with mourning rites, obviously in an intercessory sense.

Other texts associate the wearing of the *śaq* with an imminent disaster that has not yet come to (complete) fruition. The situations in 2 K. 6:30 and 19:1-2 par. Isa. 37:1-2 are similar in that they portray the hopeless situation of a besieged city (Samaria, Jerusalem) facing imminent capture.[11] The texts in Jeremiah announcing the advance of the enemy from the north portray his departure and advance and summon the Judeans and Jerusalemites to put on the *śaq* in view of the imminent invasion (Jer. 4:8; 6:26). The oracle to the nations in Jer. 49:3 basically presupposes the same situation. 1 Ch. 21:16 associates the wearing of the *śaq* with David's prayer asking Yahweh to stop the angel of pestilence in Jerusalem. Here the wearing of the *śaq* is obviously part of actions intended to assuage Yahweh's anger. The same intent may be at work in 2 K. 6:30; 19:1-2 par. Isa. 37:1-2, whereas the mention of the *śaq* in Jer. 4:8; 6:26; and 49:3 more likely emphasizes the inevitability of the coming disaster.

Texts portraying acts as a reaction to a prophecy of judgment clearly understand the wearing of the *śaq* as well as other rites as means for assuaging Yahweh and for persuading him to retract his judgment (1 K. 21:27; Jon. 3:5-8). The account of Ahab's self-abasement in 1 K. 21:27 is supposed to explain why the disaster came upon his son Joram (2 K. 9–10) rather than upon Ahab himself (v. 29 has doubtless been edited by a Dtr redactor). The rites of self-abasement in Jon. 3:5-8, including the wearing of the *śaq*, are a reaction to Jonah's prediction of the fall of the city of Nineveh (v. 4). Even though Israel shared many of these rites with its neighbors, here the author doubtless transfers Israelite customs to Nineveh as an example of what Israel itself was unable to do: to effect true conversion, which then also prompts Yahweh's forgiveness. Here the reference is apparently to a collective penitential rite encompassing all members of society, something commensurate with Dnl. 9:3 and Neh. 9:1, where the putting on of the *śaq* is apparently prompted by a current situation and stylized as an introduction to a penitential prayer (Dnl. 9:3) or a communal penitential rite (Neh. 9:1).

---

10. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 208.
11. On 2 K. 6:30 → קרע *qāra'*, XIII, 175-80.

Other texts reflect in a more general fashion the ritual character of wearing the *śaq*. The psalmist in Ps. 69:12(11) enumerates it as an example of his own zeal in worship and ritual acts that prompted his adversaries merely to scoff at him. Isa. 22:12 mentioned the *śaq* as an appropriate reaction to the imminent judgment upon Judah and Jerusalem. Although Yahweh's actions should have prompted repentance, Isaiah's blind contemporaries disregard the "signs of the times" and celebrate blasphemous feasts instead of submitting to the required penitential rites.

In the summons to communal lament in Joel 1:5-14, the *śaq* functions as part of the lament for the neglect of temple worship (v. 13) and is also associated with a young woman's lament for her deceased bridegroom (v. 8) in a manner similar to the way Jer. 6:26 and Am. 8:10 associate it with the lament for one's only son. The enlightened wisdom assertion in Isa. 58:5 seems quite contrary to the cultic atmosphere in Joel 1:5-14 in its insistence that God rejects the wearing of the *śaq* as well as other external rites as inappropriate.

The use of the *śaq* as a mourning and penitential garment is also attested in extrabiblical and postcanonical texts, including the Aramaic petition of the Jewish military colony in Elephantine to Bagoas and possibly in Ahiqar 103.[12] Among the Greek Apocrypha, it reliably occurs in 1 Mc. 2:14; 10:25; 2 Mc. 3:19; 10:25; Jdt. 4:10,11,14 (in 8:5; 9:1; 10:3, the *sákkos* is part of a widow's garment); Bar. 4:20; and finally in the NT in Mt. 11:21 par. Lk. 10:13.

5. *Individual Cases.* The ritual function of the *śaq* resulted in it becoming a metaphor for disaster, sorrow, and distress. Such metaphorical usage is found in Ps. 30:12(11), where the psalmist recounts the changing of distress into joy. The possibly fragmentary verse Isa. 50:3 even relates how Yahweh clothes the heavens with the *śaq*, an expression for Yahweh's power as Creator and Ruler of heaven and earth. In his own lamenting self-description, Job recounts how he has sewn the cloth of mourning onto his own skin and now wears it like a second skin (Job 16:15).[13] We may leave in abeyance for now the question whether this statement is to be understood as hyperbole or as a metaphor.

The interpretation of Isa. 20:1-6 is still disputed. Within the framework of a symbolic prophetic act, Isaiah takes off his *śaq* and sandals and walks around naked and barefoot, announcing thereby the fate of Egypt and Ethiopia (Cush), namely, deportation, and warning Judah against entering into an alliance with Egypt. The function of the *śaq* in this context is unclear. The suggestion that the reference is to a prophet's cloak, *'adderet̠* (1 K. 19:13,19; 2 K. 2:8,13-14; Zech. 13:4), is a makeshift solution. Nor, however, is it a reference to a "simple cloak, roughly woven."[14] The *śaq* is to be "loosened from the loins" *(ptḥ)*, i.e., it was probably worn beneath the outer clothing as in 2 K. 6:30. This point eliminates the possibility that Isaiah performed the symbolic

---

12. On Elephantine see *AP* 30.15,20 par. 31.14,19; *TGI*, 86-87; *ANET*, 492a. On Ahiqar see *AP*, 215, 237-38; cf. also *ANET*, 428-29.

13. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 289.

14. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. trans. 1997), 293.

act merely lightly clothed, i.e., in underclothes, rather than naked.[15] The most appropriate explanation is thus a literal understanding, that for reasons unknown to us Isaiah was already wearing the *śaq* and is now to take it off along with his sandals. The end of v. 4 also presupposes complete nakedness, regardless of whether these words are original or represent a gloss. Assyrian illustrations with naked prisoners of war and women lifting the fronts of their garments are not entirely without precedent,[16] and Isaiah's symbolic act here may allude to such traditions.

III. LXX. The LXX translates *śaq* as *sákkos,* the only exception being Gen. 42:27, where it chooses *mársippos.* This rendering may derive from the translator having found *'amtaḥaṯ* at both the beginning and the end of the verse.[17] The LXX translators also introduce *sákkos* into 3 K. 20:16 (= MT 1 K. 21:16) contrary to their source text, where they apparently already anticipate the penitential ceremony in v. 27. They also introduce it into Isa. 32:11, where they complete the Hebrew text commensurate with the intended sense. The *sákkos* in Sir. 25:17 in LXX^{B} is apparently a scribal error for *árkos,* which concurs with the Hebrew original.

With *sákkos* the translators chose the customary equivalent for *śaq,* since this particular Semitic word probably passed into Greek quite early through the Phoenicians, though Phoenician witnesses are still lacking. The ritual use of the *śaq* also passed into the Greco-Roman world together with the word itself. Ultimately the word passed into the European languages through Lat. *saccus.* Because it was primarily Roman merchants who transmitted the word, the predominant meaning was and is "bag of strong, coarsely woven material" or "sack." Through Luther's translation of the Bible, the "sack" as an expression of sorrow and repentance passed into general consciousness in German[18] and subsequently also into English in the idiom "in sackcloth and ashes."

Thiel

15. → XI, 353.
16. *AOB,* 128; *BHHW,* II, 1013.
17. See II.3 above.
18. J. and W. Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1854ff.), VIII, 1610-17.

שַׂר *śar;* שָׂרַר *śārar;* מִשְׂרָה *miśrâ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Outside the OT: a. Ugarit; b. El-Amarna; c. Phoenician; d. Aramaic; e. Hebrew Inscriptions; 3. Personal Names; 4. OT Occurrences; 5. Meaning: a. *śar:* Synchronic Aspects; b. *śar:* Diachronic Aspects; c. *śārâ;* d. *śārar* and *miśrâ;* 6. LXX. II. Officialdom in the Ancient Near East: 1. General Considerations; 2. Individual Manifestations: a. Egypt; b. Mesopotamia; c. Syria-Canaan. III. Officialdom in Judah and Israel: 1. Diachronic Overview; 2. Administrative Offices: a. Palace Administration; b. Forced Labor; c. The Military; d. Local and Provincial Administration; e. Legal Adjudication; 3. Reflection in Literature. IV. Exilic and Postexilic Officialdom: 1. Diachronic Overview; 2. Reflection in Literature: a. Pentateuch; b. Esther; c. Daniel; d. Chronicler's History; e. Psalms; f. Wisdom. V. Theological Considerations: 1. People; 2. Celestial Hierarchy. VI. Qumran.

śar. G. W. Ahlström, *Royal Administration and National Religion in Ancient Palestine. Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East* 1 (Leiden, 1982); A. Alt, "The Formation of the Israelite State in Palestine," *Essays on OT History and Religion* (Eng. trans., Garden City, N.Y., 1968), 223ff.; idem, "The Monarchy in the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah," *Essays on OT History and Religion,* 311ff.; idem, "Der Anteil des Königtums an der sozialen Entwicklung in den Reichen Israel und Juda," *KlSchr,* III (1959), 348-72; N. Avigad, "The Governor of the City," *IEJ* 26 (1976) 178-82; idem, "שׂר העיר," *Qad* 10 (1977) 68-69; idem, *Hebrew Bullae from the Time of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem, 1986), esp. 30-33; G. Barkay, "בולה שניית של שׂר העיר," *Qad* 10 (1977) 69-71; J. Bright, "The Organization and Administration of the Israelite Empire," *Magnalia Dei. FS G. E. Wright* (Garden City, N.Y., 1976), 193-208; J. Buchholz, *Die Ältesten Israels im Deuteronomium. GTA* 36 (1988); A. Caquot, "Préfets," *DBS,* VIII, 273-86; H. Cazelles, "Institutions et terminologie en Deut. I 6-17," *Volume de Congrès, Genève 1965. SVT* 15 (1966), 97-112, esp. 104-6; M. Clauss, *Gesellschaft und Staat in Juda und Israel. Eichstätter Hochschulreden* 48 (1985); J. A. Dearman, *Property Rights in the Eighth-Century Prophets. SBLDS* 106 (1988); H. Donner, "Studien zur Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte der Reiche Israel und Juda" (diss., Leipzig, 1956), esp. 61-97; idem, "Die soziale Botschaft der Propheten im Lichte der Gesellschaftsordnung in Israel," *OrAnt* 2 (1963) 229-45; P. Frei, "Zentralgewalt und Lokalautonomie im Achämenidenreich," idem and K. Koch, *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich. OBO* 55 (1984), 7-43; V. Fritz, "Salomo," *MDOG* 117 (1985) 47-67; K. Galling, *Die israelitische Staatsverfassung in ihrer vorderorientalischen Umwelt. AO* 28 (1929); E. W. Heaton, *Solomon's New Men* (London, 1974), esp. 47-60; E. Junge, *Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia. BWANT* 75 (1937); J. Kegler, "Arbeitsorganisation und Arbeitskampfformen im AT," in L. and W. Schottroff, eds., *Mitarbeiter der Schöpfung* (Munich, 1983), 51-71; K. Koch, "Die Entstehung der sozialen Kritik bei den Profeten," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 236-57; E. Lipiński, "Royal and State Scribes in Ancient Jerusalem," *Congress Volume, Jerusalem 1986. SVT* 40 (1988), 157-64; B. Mazar, "The Military Elite of King David," *The Early Biblical Period* (Jerusalem, 1986), 83-103; idem, "King David's Scribe and the High Officialdom of the United Monarchy of Israel," *Early Biblical Period,* 126-38; S. E. McEvenue, "The Political Structure in Judah from Cyrus to Nehemiah," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 353-64; T. N. D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy. CBOT* 5 (1971); N. Na'aman, "The List of David's Officers (ŠĀLÎŠÎM)," *VT* 38 (1988) 71-79; H. Niehr, *Herrschen und Richten. FzB* 54 (1986), esp. 127-71; idem, *Rechtsprechung in Israel. SBS* 130

I. 1. *Etymology.* The Hebrew term *śar* represents a substantive of the *qall* type deriving from a geminate or ע"ע root, which doubles the second consonant in the plural

---

(1987), esp. 81-84, 91-101; R. North, "Civil Authority in Ezra," *FS E. Volterra* (Milan, 1971), 377-404; M. Noth, "Das Krongut der israelitischen Könige und seine Verwaltung," *ZDPV* 50 (1927) 211-44, repr. *ABLAK*, I, 159-82; S. M. Paul, "Hosea 8,8-10 משׂא מלך שׂרים and Ancient Near Eastern Royal Titles," *Studies in Bible and the Ancient Near East. FS S. E. Loewenstamm* (Jerusalem, 1978), 309-17; J. van der Ploeg, "Les chefs du peuple d'Israël et leurs titres," *RB* 57 (1950) 40-61; idem, "Les 'noble' Israélites," *OTS* 9 (1951) 49-64; I. Rabinowitz, "Government," *IDB*, II, 451-62; H. Graf Reventlow, "Hofstaat," *BHHW*, II, 733-34; H. Reviv, "The Tradition Concerning the Inception of the Legal System in Israel: Significance and Dating," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 566-75; idem, *The Elders in Ancient Israel* (Jerusalem, 1989); U. Rüterswörden, *Die Beamten der israelitischen Königszeit. BWANT* 117 (1985); idem, "Beamte," *NBL*, 252-54; P. Schäfer, *The History of the Jews in Antiquity* (Eng. trans., Luxembourg, 1995); C. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Stadt und Eidgenossenschaft im AT. BZAW* 156 (1983), esp. 243-54; W. Schottroff, "Arbeit und sozialer Konflikt im nachexilischen Juda," in L. and W. Schottroff, eds., *Mitarbeiter der Schöpfung* (Munich, 1983), 104-48, esp. 120-21; W. Thiel, "Soziale Wandlungen in der frühen Königszeit Alt-Israels," in H. Klengel, ed., *Gesellschaft und Kultur im alten Vorderasien* (Berlin, 1982), 235-46; idem, "Soziale Auswirkungen der Herrschaft Salomos," in T. Rendtorff, ed., *Charisma und Institution* (Gütersloh, 1985), 297-314; H. Utzschneider, *Hosea, Prophet vor dem Ende. OBO* 31 (1980), esp. 129-40; H. C. M. Vogt, *Studien zur nachexilischen Gemeinde in Esra-Nehemia* (Werl i.W., 1966), esp. 103-7; J. P. Weinberg, "Zentral- und Partikulargewalt im achämenidischen Reich," *Klio* 59 (1977), 25-43, esp. 36-38; M. Weinfeld, "Judge and Officer in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East," *IOS* 7 (1977) 65-88; S. Yeivin, "The Administration in Ancient Israel" (Heb.), in A. Malamat, ed., *The Kingdoms of Israel and Judah* (Jerusalem, 1961), IX-X, 47-65.

On II.1: K. Eder, *Die Entstehung staatlich organisierter Gesellschaften* (Frankfurt am Main, 1967); R. C. Hunt, "The Role of Bureaucracy in the Provisioning of Cities: A Framework for Analysis of the Ancient Near East," in M. Gibson and R. D. Biggs, eds., *The Organization of Power: Aspects of Bureaucracy in the Ancient Near East. SAOC* 46 (1987), 161-92; P. Michalowski, "Charisma and Control: On Continuity and Change in Early Mesopotamian Bureaucratic Systems," ibid., 55-68; C. Schäfer, "Stadtstaat und Eidgenossenschaft. Max Webers Analyse der vorexilischen Gesellschaft," in W. Schluchter, ed., *Max Webers Studie über das antike Judentum* (Frankfurt am Main, 1981), 78-109; M. Weber, *Economy and Society* (Eng. trans., Berkeley, 1978).

On II.2.a: M. Görg, "Ägypten," *NBL*, 36-49, esp. 44-45; R. Gundlach et al., "Der Staat des frühen Neuen Reiches: Königtum, Verwaltung und Beamtenschaft," in A. Eggebrecht, ed., *Ägyptens Aufstieg zur Weltmacht* (Mainz, 1987), 29-40; W. Helck, *Untersuchungen zu den Beamtentiteln des Ägyptischen Alten Reiches. Ägyptologische Forschungen* 18 (Glückstadt, 1954); idem, *Zur Verwaltung des Mittleren und Neuen Reichs* (Leiden, 1958); idem, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Alten Ägypten im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. HO* I/1,5, esp. 56-72, 249-58; idem, "Beamtentum," *LexÄg*, I, 672-75; idem, "Landesverwaltung," *LexÄg*, III, 918-22; idem, *Politische Gegensätze im Alten Ägypten. Hildesheimer Ägyptologische Beiträge* 23 (Hildesheim, 1986); idem, "Ägypten im frühen Neuen Reich. Grundzüge einer Entwicklung," in A. Eggebrecht, ed., *Ägyptens Aufstieg zur Weltmacht* (Mainz, 1987), 11-27; E. Hornung, *Einführung in die Ägyptologie* (Darmstadt, [2]1984), esp. 80-87; E. Martin-Pardey, "Wesir, Wesirat," *LexÄg*, VI, 1227-35; idem, "Die Verwaltung im Alten Reich. Grenzen und Möglichkeiten von Untersuchungen zu diesem Thema," *Beiträge zur Orientalistik* 46 (1989) 533-52.

On II.2.b: D. O. Edzard, "Herrscher. A. Philologisch," *RLA*, IV, 335-42; A. Finet, "Les autorités locales dans le royaume de Mari," *Akkadica* 26 (1982) 1-16; P. Garelli, "Hofstaat. B. Assyrisch," *RLA*, IV, 446-52; J. V. Kinnier Wilson, *The Nimrud Wine Lists* (London, 1972), esp.

or, as in the case of *śar* itself, undergoes virtual doubling.[1] With respect to the etymology of Heb. *śar,* one can refer to Akk. *šarru(m),* "king," *šarratu(m),* "queen," and

---

7-110; E. Klauber, *Assyrisches Beamtentum nach Briefen aus der Sargonidenzeit. LSSt* V/3 (1910); O. Krückmann et al., "Beamter," *RLA,* I, 441-67; B. Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien,* I (Heidelberg, 1920), esp. 115-46; J. Pečirková, "The Administrative Organisation of the Neo-Assyrian Empire," *ArOr* 45 (1977) 211-28; J. Renger, "Hofstaat. A. Bis ca. 1500 v. Chr.," *RLA,* IV, 435-46; O. Rouault, "Quelques remarques sur le système administratif de Mari à l'époque ZimriLim," *Compte rendu de la Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* 19 (Paris, 1974) 263-72; idem, *Mukannišum. L'administration et l'économie palatiales à Mari. ARM* XVIII (1977), esp. 216-56; W. von Soden, *The Ancient Orient* (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1994); P. Steinkeller, "The Administrative and Economic Organization of the Ur III State: The Core and Periphery," in M. Gibson and R. D. Biggs, eds., *The Organization of Power. SAOC* 46 (1987), 19-41.

On II.2.c: A. Alt, "The Settlement of the Israelites in Palestine," *Essays in OT History and Religion,* 173ff.; idem, "Das Stützpunktsystem der Pharaonen an der phönikischen Küste und im syrischen Binnenland," *KlSchr,* III (1959), 107-40; idem, "Hohe Beamte in Ugarit," *KlSchr,* III (1959), 186-97; idem, "Menschen ohne Namen," *KlSchr,* III (1959), 198-213; K.-H. Bernhardt, "Verwaltungspraxis im spätbronzezeitlichen Palästina," in H. Klengel, ed., *Beiträge zur sozialen Struktur des Alten Vorderasien* (Berlin, 1971), 133-47; G. Buccellati, *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria. SS* 26 (1967); D. O. Edzard and F. A. Wiggermann, "*maškim (rābiṣu)* 'Kommissar, Anwalt, Sachwalter,'" *RLA,* VII, 449-55, esp. 452-53; R. Hachmann, "Die ägyptische Verwaltung in Syrien während der Amarnazeit," *ZDPV* 98 (1982) 17-49; W. Helck, "Die ägyptische Verwaltung in den syrischen Besitzungen," *MDOG* 92 (1960) 1-13; idem, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. ÄgAbh* 5 ([2]1971), esp. 246-55; M. Heltzer, "Problems of the Social History of Syria in the Late Bronze Age," in M. Liverani, ed., *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo. OAC* 9 (1969), 31-46; idem, *The Rural Community in Ancient Ugarit* (Wiesbaden, 1976); idem, "Royal Economy in Ancient Ugarit," in E. Lipiński, ed., *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East II. OLA* 6 (1979), 459-96; idem, *The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit* (Wiesbaden, 1982); "The King's Decision and Executive Power in Ugarit and in Canaan in the XIV-XIII Cent. B.C.E.," *SEL* 4 (1987) 45-55; idem, *Antico Oriente* (Rome, 1988), esp. 541-76; S. Israelit-Groll, "The Egyptian Administrative System in Syria and Palestine in the 18th Dynasty," *Fontes atque pontes. FS H. Brunner. ÄAT* 5 (1983), 234-42; K. A. Kitchen, "Interrelations of Egypt and Syria," in M. Liverani, ed., *La Siria nel Tardo Bronzo. OAC* 9 (1969), 77-95, esp. 80-82; M. Liverani, "La royauté syrienne de l'âge du Bronze Récent," *Compte rendu de la Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale* 19 (Paris, 1974), 329-56; idem, "Communautés de village et palais royal dans la Syrie du IIème millénaire," *JESHO* 18 (1975) 146-64; idem, "Communautés rurales dans la Syrie du II[e] millénaire A.C.," *Recueil de la Societé J. Bodin pour l'histoire comparative des institutions* (Paris, 1986), 147-85; A. K. Mohammed, "The Administration of Syro-Palestine During the New Kingdom," *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte* 56 (Cairo, 1959) 105-37; N. Na'aman, "Economic Aspects of the Egyptian Occupation of Canaan," *IEJ* 31 (1981) 172-85; A. F. Rainey, *The Social Stratification of Ugarit* (Ann Arbor, 1962); J. Renger, "*Zur Wurzel Mlk* in akkadischen Texten aus Syrien und Palästina," *Archivi Reali di Ebla. Studi* I (Rome, 1988), 165-72; H. Reviv, "On Urban Representative Institutions and Self-Government in Syria-Palestine in the Second Half of the Second Millennium B.C.," *JESHO* 12 (1969) 283-97; M. W. Several, "Reconsidering the Egyptian Empire in Palestine During the Amarna Period," *PEQ* 104 (1972) 123-33; W. Thiel, *Die soziale Entwicklung Israels in vorstaatlicher Zeit* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, [2]1985), esp. 65-75.

On V: K. Koch, *Das Buch Daniel. EdF* 144 (1980), esp. 205-13; J. Schreiner, *Alttestamentlich-jüdische Apokalyptik* (Munich, 1969), esp. 130-41.

1. JM, §§88g, 96An; *BLe,* §71.

šarrūtu(m), "kingdom,"[2] which rather suggest a nondeverbal substantive (von Soden). That the Akkadian *š* is normally retained in Northwest Semitic and yet in the case of *šarrum* becomes *śar* can be explained by derivation from an Akkadian word *śarrum.*[3] Hebrew differentiation between *ś* and *š* was also influenced by Aramaic, through which this distinction was effected.[4] One striking semantic difference between the East and West Semitic lexemes is that in West Semitic, *śar* rarely refers to the king, and the tendency is for *śar* to refer to someone subordinated to the king, whereas Akk. *šarrum* refers not to an official but to the king himself. The designation for foreign (rarely also domestic) kings in Akkadian is *malkum.*[5] The semantic difference between East Semitic *šarrum* and Northwest Semitic *śar* is first attested in 3rd-millennium Ebla when the king of Ebla, who bears the Sumerian title *EN,* bears this title with *malikum* in bilingual witnesses.[6] This emergent independence of Syrian political terminology from that in Mesopotamia is complemented in the 2nd millennium by a semantic development that results in *šarru* referring in some texts to a "vassal king" or "lesser king."[7]

The meaning of *šarru* as "vassal king" can still be discerned in OT Hebrew in Isa. 10:8 and Hos. 8:10, where the Assyrian king's vassals are called *śārîm.*[8] The Yahweh designation *śar śārîm* in Dnl. 8:25 incorporates Akk. *šar šarrāni* into OT Hebrew.

As a result of this development, the title *šarru rabûl,* "high king,"[9] came to be distinguished from *šarru,* "lesser king." This diminution of the title *šarru,* however, was countered in Northwest Semitic by an enhancement of the title *malikum* because 2nd-millennium Northwest Semitic (lesser) kings increasingly used the latter title, one attested since Ebla, as a self-designation.

The semantic relationship sometimes accepted between Heb. *śar* and Egyp. *śr,* "noble, prince,"[10] by virtue of which the Hebrew term is sometimes even alleged to have developed under Egyptian influence,[11] cannot be demonstrated persuasively.[12]

2. *Outside the OT.* The function of the term *śar* to indicate both an independent king and someone subordinated to the high king comes to expression in Northwest Semitic witnesses.

---

2. *AHw,* III, 1188ff.
3. *AHw,* III, 1188.
4. W. Diem, "Das Problem von שׂ im Althebräischen und die kanaanäische Lautverschiebung," *ZDMG* 124 (1974) 243-45.
5. *AHw,* II, 595-96; *CAD,* X/I, 167-68.
6. G. Pettinato, *The Archives of Ebla* (Eng. trans., New York, 1981), 74.
7. K. Balkan, *Letter of King Anum-Hirbi of Mama to King Warshama of Kanish* (Ankara, 1957), 25-28; *AHw,* III, 1189.
8. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 418-19; H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 143; J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* 24/1 (1983), 110.
9. Seux, 298ff.
10. *WbÄS,* IV, 188-89.
11. J. Begrich, "Sōfēr und Mazkīr," *GSAT. ThB* 21 (1964), 81-82; Mettinger, 3.
12. Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 62.

a. *Ugarit.* The earliest witness in Northwest Semitic is the term *šr* with the meaning "prince" or "king" in Ugarit.[13] Aqhat bears the title,[14] as do human beings and gods in other texts, including perhaps El.[15] The form *ṯr* is also attested meaning "vassal prince," not to be confused with *ṯr,* "bull."[16]

b. *El-Amarna.* In the 14th-century Akkadian Amarna letters, which are permeated by a Northwest Semitic substratum, the title *šarru* refers to a lesser king or mayoral official acting as governor;[17] here *šarru* parallels *ḫazannu* and *awīlu.*[18] One must note, however, that *šarru* did not entirely divest itself of the meaning "king," since in the Amarna tablets *šarru* continues to refer to Pharaoh.[19] The semantic ambiguity of *šarru* discernible here in the Amarna letters concurs with the changing terminology for Egyptian governors in Syria-Palestine during the Amarna period.[20]

c. *Phoenician.* Phoenician witnesses from 5th-century Sidon attest *śr* as a divine title in reference to the god Eshmun as *śr qdš,* "holy prince,"[21] a title comparable to *b'l qdš.*[22] The occasionally advocated understanding as "Eshmun of the holy field" is supported neither textually nor by content.[23]

d. *Aramaic.* Phoenician usage is continued in a Palmyrene inscription referring to the sun god as *šrn rb',* "our great prince."[24] Late Aramaic inscriptions (7th century C.E.) attest the subst. *śrrw,* "dominion, rule," as the name of an angel, "great rule."[25]

e. *Hebrew Inscriptions.* In extrabiblical Hebrew, *śar* is attested with the meaning

---

13. *WUS,* no. 2680.

14. *KTU* 1, 19, I, 11; cf. *TO,* I, 442.

15. *KTU* 4.610, r. 45-46; 1.23, 1-2; cf. C. M. Foley, "Are the 'Gracious Gods' *BN ŠRM*?" *UF* 19 (1987) 61-74; regarding El: *KTU* 1.12, II, 50-51; cf. N. Wyatt, "Atonement Theology in Ugarit and Israel," *UF* 8 (1976) 421; "The Identity of *mt wšr,*" *UF* 9 (1977) 381; but cf. G. Del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaan* (Madrid, 1981), 485; J. C. de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit. Nisaba* 16 (New York, 1987), 134; El also in *KTU* 1.123, 3; cf. Foley, 71. Concerning the problem of the DN *mtwšr,* cf. J. C. de Moor, "Studies in the New Alphabetic Texts," *UF* 2 (1970) 314; Foley, 71 n. 41.

16. *KTU* 1.15, IV:6, 8, 17, 19; V:3 (emended); *WUS,* no. 2933; del Olmo Lete, 306-7; concerning the meaning of the Ugar. PN *šry,* see *PNU,* 196, 249.

17. EA 53:41-44; 57:2,3; 92:32-34; 140:10-12; 147:67; 148:25,40-41; 151:52-55; 227:3; 256:8; 364:18; A. F. Rainey, *El Amarna Tablets* 359-379. *AOAT* 8 (^{2}1978), 26.

18. W. L. Moran, *The Amarna Letters* (Eng. trans., Baltimore, 1992), xxvii n. 73.

19. Cf. the witnesses in J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln* (Leipzig, 1915), 1517.

20. Hachmann, 25, 29-30; Moran, *Amarna Letters,* xxvii n. 73.

21. *KAI* 14.17; 15; 16; *ANET,* 662b.

22. *CIS,* I, 4841; 4963; cf. J. M. Lindenberger, "The Gods of Ahiqar," *UF* 14 (1982) 115 n. 54.

23. H. Gese, in Gese et al., *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 189; J. T. Milik, "Les papyrus araméens d'Hermoupolis et les cultes syro-phéniciens," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 573 n. 3; J. Ebach, *Weltentstehung und Kulturentwicklung bei Philo von Byblos. BWANT* 108 (1979), 207; J. Teixidor, "Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique 1968/1969," *Syr* 46 (1969) 326, no. 39; *TSSI,* III, 108-9, 112-13; C. Bonnet, "La terminologie phénico-punique relative au métier de la picide et à la gravure des textes," *SEL* 7 (1990) 139.

24. H. Ingholt et al., *Recueil des tessères de Palmyre. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique* 58 (Paris, 1955), 333; *DNSI,* II, 1191; cf. in this regard R. C. du Mesnil du Buisson, *Les tessères et les monnaies de Palmyre* (Paris, 1962), 412.

25. Beyer, 719; cf. 372.

"officer" and "official." In the petition from Meṣad Ḥashavyahu, the petitioner addresses the adjudicating lord as *śr.*[26]

The military function of the *śar* emerges in the Lachish ostraca, which refer to Coniah as *śr hṣbh,* "commander."[27] A second occurrence in the Lachish ostraca is incomprehensible because of textual corruption.[28]

The function of a *śar* as a "chief" or "leader" might be attested on a Jerusalem pitcher inscription, emended to *lśr h'w(pym).*[29]

Several Hebrew bullae found in Jerusalem use the designation *śr h'r* to refer to the royal governor appointed over the city (cf. Avigad; Barkay); here one may adduce the corresponding witnesses from Jgs. 9:28-30 (Shechem); 1 K. 22:26; 2 Ch. 18:25 (Samaria); and 34:8 (Jerusalem) (cf. also 2 K. 23:8).

Scholars are undecided whether the expression *'ryhw hśr* in the tomb inscription from Khirbet el-Qom (II, 1) is to be read "Uriyahu the governor," *h'šr,* "Uriyahu the rich," *hqšb,* "be careful," or *hšr,* "the singer."[30]

The understanding of the inscription *lśr 'r* on four pitchers from Kuntillet ʿAjrud is similarly questionable. Although some read this expression as the title of the governor of Kuntillet ʿAjrud in defective orthography, the relative insignificance of the locale militates against this understanding and rather suggests the presence of an unknown personal name.[31]

3. *Personal Names.* The subst. *śar* occurs in extrabiblical Hebrew witnesses as an element in personal names, including *śr, śrmlk,* and *śryhw.*[32] No consensus has yet emerged with regard to the understanding of the PN *sr'* on an Aramaic papyrus.[33] The OT itself attests the names *śᵉrāyâ* (2 S. 8:17; 2 K. 25:18,23; Jer. 40:8; 51:59; etc.) and *śᵉrāyāhû* (Jer. 36:26). Derivation of these personal names from the root *śrr* is disputed;

---

26. *KAI* 200.1,12.

27. A. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébraïques,* vol. 1: *Les Ostraca. LAPO* 9 (1977), 103-4; *KAI* 193.14; *ANET,* 322a (ostracon III).

28. *KAI* 196.4.

29. Cf. E. Mazar, "Ophel Excavations, Jerusalem, 1986," *IEJ* 37 (1987) 62.

30. J. Naveh, "Graffiti and Dedications," *BASOR* 235 (1979) 28; A. Angerstorfer, "Ašerah als 'consort of Jahwe' oder Aširtah," *BN* 17 (1982) 9; A. Lemaire, "Les Inscriptions de Khirbet El-Qôm et l'Ashérah de YHWH," *RB* 84 (1977) 599; K. Jaroš, "Zur Inschrift Nr 3 von Hirbet el-Qom," *BN* 19 (1982) 32-33, 36; B. Margalit, "Some Observations on the Inscription and Drawing from Khirbet El-Qôm," *VT* 39 (1989) 373; W. G. Dever, "Iron Age Epigraphic Material from the Area of Khirbet El-Kôm," *HUCA* 40/41 (1969/70) 159-60; S. Mittmann, "Die Grabinschrift des Sängers Uriahu," *ZDPV* 97 (1981) 139-52.

31. Avigad, *Hebrew Bullae,* 32 n. 31.

32. F. Vattioni, "I sigilli ebraici," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 370, no. 99; idem, "Sigilli ebraici III," *AION* 38 (1978) 243, no. 333; P. Bordreuil and A. Lemaire, "Nouveaux sceaux hébreux et araméens," *Sem* 32 (1982) 30, no. 12; N. Avigad, "Baruch the Scribe and Jerahmeel the King's Son," *IEJ* 28 (1978) 56; concerning additional personal names formed from the base *śar,* cf. M. H. Silverman, *Religious Values in the Jewish Proper Names at Elephantine. AOAT* 217 (1985), 178.

33. Cf. P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee, "Le papyrus de *marzeaḥ,*" *FS M. Sznyczer. Sem* 38 (1990) 54-55.

some scholars adduce a root *śārâ,* "strive, contend," whereas Noth refers to the unattested root *śārâ* as a secondary form of *śārar.*[34] Otherwise the PN *śārâ* (Gen. 17:15,17,19, etc.) with the secondary form *śāray* (Gen. 11:29,30,31; 12:5; etc.) is to be understood as a feminine form of *śar.* In any event, *śārar* is probably denominated from the primary noun.

In Gen. 11:29 the personal names of Abraham's and Nahor's wives constitute a pair: *śāray* (princess) and *milkâ* (queen), a pair already appearing in connection with the cult of the lunar god of Ur and Haran.[35] Its incorporation into the OT represents a reminiscence designed to evoke the local northern Mesopotamian atmosphere, but should not be invested with any religio-historical significance.[36]

The name change of Abraham's wife from *śāray* to *śārâ* effected by P^G in Gen. 17:15 introduces an old feminine form into the normal form.[37] This change corresponds to the renaming of Abraham in Gen. 17:5 (P^G), which by way of etymology tries to explain what in Sarah's case need not be said because of the unequivocal nature of her name.

4. *OT Occurrences.* The subst. *śar* occurs 421 times in the OT.[38] The term occurs throughout the entire breadth of the OT, though less frequently in the wisdom writings (10 times) and Psalms (9 times) and more frequently in the Chronicler's History (123 times). The term *śar* occurs 59 times in the Pentateuch, 88 times in the Dtr History, and 87 times in the prophets. It also occurs 4 times in Lamentations, 15 in Esther, and 17 in Daniel. The feminine form *śārâ* occurs 5 times (Jgs. 5:29; 1 K. 11:3; Est. 1:18; Isa. 49:23; Lam. 1:1).

The vb. *śārar* occurs altogether 6 times (qal: Jgs. 9:22; Est. 1:22; Prov. 8:16; Isa. 32:1; hiphil: Hos. 8:4; hithpael: Nu. 16:13), and the noun deriving from it, *miśrâ,* twice (Isa. 9:5-6[Eng. 6-7]).

5. *Meaning.* a. *śar: Synchronic Aspects.* An understanding of the specific meaning of the term *śar* requires an examination of other terms relating to office within the context of the exercise of authority. Although the term → מֶלֶךְ *meleḵ* occurs several times parallel to *śar* (2 K. 11:14; 1 Ch. 24:6; 2 Ch. 12:6; 28:21; 29:30; 30:2,6,12,24; 36:18; Ezra 7:28; 8:25; Neh. 9:32,34; Est. 1:16,21; Ps. 148:11; Prov. 8:15-16; Eccl. 10:16-17; Isa. 10:8; 32:1; 49:7; Jer. 1:18; 2:26; 4:9; 8:1; 17:25; 24:1,8; 25:18; 26:21; 32:32; 34:21; 36:21; 44:17,21; 49:38; Lam. 2:9; Ezk. 17:12; Dnl. 9:6,8; Hos. 3:4; 7:3,5; 13:10; Am. 1:15; Zeph. 1:8; cf. Isa. 34:12), in all these passages it refers to an authority to which the *śar* is subordinated, something also emerging from the construct expres-

34. *GesB,* 793; *HAL,* III, 1354; *IPN,* 191-92 n. 1.

35. H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Eng. trans., Macon, Ga., 1997), 162; C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. trans. 1985), 138.

36. On the Akkadian and Egyptian versions of these PNs, see J. J. Stamm, *Beiträge zur Hebräischen und altorientalischen Namenkunde. OBO* 30 (1980), 122-23.

37. *GK,* §80l; *BLe,* §62d′.

38. Even-Shoshan, 1205-7.

sions in which *śar* appears with *meleḵ* or with the personal name of a king as the *nomen rectum* (Nu. 22:13,35; Jgs. 4:7; 2 S. 10:16; 2 K. 5:1; 2 Ch. 26:11; Ezra 7:28; Est. 1:18; 6:9; Jer. 38:17-18,22; 39:3; cf. *śārê parʿōh* in Gen. 12:15) and in the passages with *śar* that refer with an enclitic personal pronoun to *meleḵ* or to a king mentioned by name (Gen. 21:22,32; 26:26; Jgs. 4:2; 1 S. 14:50; 26:5; 2 S. 10:18; 2 Ch. 17:7; 26:11; 30:2,6; 32:3; 35:8; 36:18; Ezra 8:25; Est. 1:3; 2:18; Isa. 10:8; Jer. 8:1; 24:8; 25:19; 34:21; 49:3; Dnl. 11:5; Am. 1:15). The only passages referring to a king with the title *śar* are Hos. 8:10, though even here the construct expression *meleḵ śārîm* in fact reflects Akk. *šar šarrāni,*[39] and Isa. 9:5(6) in a postexilic eschatological context in order to avoid the term *meleḵ.*[40]

One title comparable to *śar* is → עֶבֶד *ʿeḇeḏ,* as suggested by the parallel titles in Gen. 41:10; 2 S. 19:7(6); 1 K. 9:22; 16:9; 2 K. 24:12; Est. 1:3; 2:18; 5:11; Ps. 119:23; Jer. 25:19), though such parallels are not to be understood as synonyms. During the early monarchy, the term *ʿeḇeḏ* originally referred to members of the royal staff to whom administrative offices were transferred as the monarchy itself grew. Hence *ʿeḇeḏ* and *śar* are not identical titles, since officeholders designated as *ʿeḇeḏ* never transcend the sphere of the royal staff.[41] Differences between the *śar* and *ʿeḇeḏ* emerge in the positions taken by the two groups in Jer. 36. One might also note the varying meanings of the two terms as discernible especially when *śar* and *ʿeḇeḏ* appear as opposites (Prov. 19:10; Eccl. 10:7) representing the upper and lower classes. Later passages, however, do indeed attest a certain leveling of the meaning of *ʿeḇeḏ* and *śar* toward synonymity.[42]

In connection with clan or tribal organization, → זָקֵן *zāqēn* parallels *śar* (Jgs. 8:14; 2 K. 10:1; Ezra 10:8; Ps. 105:22; Isa. 3:14; Lam. 5:12). The difference between *śar* and *zāqēn* is that the *śar* represents the king, the *zāqēn* the people. These two official spheres do not overlap as long as the *śar* is responsible only for royal administration and the *zāqēn* only for local matters. Because both groups belonged to the upper classes, however, they often represented the same interests, something reflected by the prophets' social criticism, which reproaches both together.[43]

One should note that the term → שֹׁפֵט *šōpēṭ* can refer both to an official and to a king. To that extent, Am. 2:3 presupposes the same subordinate relationship between *šōpēṭ* and *śārîm* as that between *meleḵ* and *śārîm.* The difference between *śar* and *šōpēṭ* is that during the period preceding statehood, the *šōpēṭ* referred to an office of tribal leadership that disappeared with the emergence of the monarchy and was not revived during the monarchy itself in the sense of a gubernatorial office (2 S. 15:1-5). When during the late preexilic period authority of adjudication was restricted to official judges, an element of collegiality emerged between *śar and šōpēṭ* (Mic. 7:3; Zeph.

39. Seux, 318-19; Wolff, *Hosea,* 143; Jeremias, *Hosea,* 110.

40. W. Werner, *Eschatologische Texte in Jes 1–39. Messias, Heiliger Rest, Völker. FzB* 46 (1982), 37-38.

41. Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 4-19; → X, 390-92 (§ III.5).

42. See IV.2.b.

43. See III.1.

3:3). The parallel use of the two terms can also refer in a general sense to representatives of the upper classes (Ex. 2:14; Ps. 148:11). During the postexilic period, the *šōpēṭ* was projected back onto the tribal organization of the premonarchical period, a fate also applied to the *śar*,[44] as shown by the parallel use of the two titles in Dt. 1:15-16.

The term *śar* may also parallel a whole series of titles referring to different officeholders. Groups organized according to specific vocations include officials associated with the court administration (*sārîs:* Gen. 37:36; 39:1; 40:2; 2 K. 24:12; Jer. 29:2; 34:19; *mazkîr:* 2 Ch. 34:8; *yô'ēṣ:* Ezra 7:28; 8:25; Isa. 9:5[6]; cf. Job 3:14-15; *kōhēn:* 1 Ch. 23:2; 24:6; Neh. 9:32,34; 10:1[9:38]; Jer. 1:18; 2:26; 4:9; 8:1; 32:32; 49:3; *peḥâ:* Est. 3:12; 8:9; 9:3; Jer. 51:57; *mal'āḵ:* Isa. 30:4), members of the military (*gibbôr:* 2 K. 24:14; 1 Ch. 29:24; 2 Ch. 32:3,21; Isa. 9:5[6]; Jer. 26:21; 51:57; *'anšê milḥāmâ:* 1 K. 9:22; *pᵉqûḏîm:* Nu. 31:14,48; 2 K. 11:15; 2 Ch. 23:14), and representatives of the upper classes (*nāḏîḇ:* Nu. 21:18; Prov. 8:16; *nāgîḏ:* Job 29:9-10; 1 Ch. 13:1; 2 Ch. 32:21; *sāgān:* Ezra 9:2; Jer. 51:57; *nāṯîn:* Ezra 8:20; *gāḏôl:* 2 S. 3:38; *nᵉśu' pānîm:* 2 K. 5:1; Isa. 3:3; *mᵉḥōqēq:* Jgs. 5:14-15; *'addîr:* 2 Ch. 23:20; *ḥāḵām:* Isa. 19:11; Jer. 50:35; 51:57; *niḵbāḏ:* 1 S. 22:14; Isa. 23:8). Terms contrasted with *śar* include *dal* (Job 34:19) and *'eḇeḏ* (Prov. 19:10; Eccl. 10:7). In summary, *śar* in reference to an official or officer represents the semantic equivalent to Akk., Ugar., and Aram. *rab(û)* as the title of an official or officer.[45]

b. *śar: Diachronic Aspects.* Diachronically one can discern several different stages in the use of the title *śar*, some prompted by social changes. Preceding or apart from the monarchy, the *śar* refers to the leader of a group (1 S. 22:2; 2 S. 4:2; 1 K. 11:24). During the monarchy itself, this basic use of *śar* was both expanded and restricted in various social contexts. The title can now refer to officials appointed by the king to posts in palace or local administration[46] as well as to officers.[47] This use of *śar* during the monarchy led to a general use of *śar* to refer to a member of the upper classes, which together with the frequent LXX translation of the title as *árchōn* and the Latin translation *princeps* led to a translation of the title *śar* as "prince." After the fall of the monarchy, the Chronicler's History uses *śar* to refer to any leadership function within tribal/clan, administrative, cultic, and military contexts. The use of *śar* in cultic contexts prompted a theological use of the term in connection with celestial hierarchies (Josh. 5:14-15; Dnl. 8:11,25; 10:13,20-21; 12:1).

c. *śārâ.* The feminine form *śārâ* refers to the wife of a *śar* (Est. 1:18) and to the wives of a king (1 K. 11:3; Isa. 49:23). Lam. 1:1 uses this title to refer to Jerusalem as the "mistress of the provinces." This passage shows how an old form of the singular feminine construct ending in *-î (śārāṯî)* intruded into the absolute state and is maintained here before a noun added by way of preposition.[48]

d. *śārar and miśrâ.* The noun *miśrâ* (occurring only twice, Isa. 9:5-6[6-7]) and the

44. See IV.2.a.
45. See Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 56-57.
46. See III.2.a,b,d below.
47. See III.2.c below
48. *GK,* §90l; *BLe,* §65l.

vb. *śārar* express the aspects of office and rule in a general fashion, though in contrast to *mālak* they involve the exercise of an office not associated with the royal staff. This situation emerges with particular clarity in the case of the vb. *śārar.* Isa. 32:1 and Prov. 8:15-16 use it with the subject *śārîm* parallel to "kings." Hos. 8:4 (hiphil) uses it to refer to an appointment to office. In Est. 1:22 it refers to a man's dominion in his own house. Nu. 16:13 (hithpael) uses it in the accusation that Moses has made himself lord. Only Jgs. 9:22 seems to use *śārar* to refer to the rule of a king. Use of the root *śārar* to refer to Abimelech's rule, however, occurs in connection with criticism of his kingship.[49]

The noun *miśrâ* is problematic in that its Masoretic vocalization suggests derivation from the unattested vb. *śārâ* II.[50] G. R. Driver adduces 1QIsa^a with the plene orthography *m^{e}śôrâ,* which can be understood as a *maqṭul* form of the vb. *śārar,*[51] though *miqṭal* constructions from medial geminate verbs are also attested.[52]

6. *LXX.* The most frequent LXX translation of the title *śar* is *árchōn,* including in the construct expressions using *śar,* which the LXX translates using a compound with *árch-*.[53] Other translations include *hēgoúmenos* (1 S. 22:2; 2 S. 3:38; 4:2; 1 K. 14:27; 16:16; 2 K. 1:9,13; 1 Ch. 12:22[21]; 27:8; 2 Ch. 17:7) and *megistánes* (2 Ch. 36:18; Prov. 8:16; Isa. 34:12; Jer. 24:8; 25:18 [49:38]; 27[50]:35; 32:5 [25:19]; 41[34]:10). Less frequent translations include *ángelos* (Dnl. 10:21; 12:1), *adrós* (Job 29:9); *aphēgoúmenos* (Ezk. 11:1), *diádochos* (2 Ch. 26:11), *dynástēs* (Dnl. 9:6,8; 11:5), *eleútheros* (Jer. 36[29]:2), *éndoxos* (2 Ch. 36:14), *éntimos* (Job 34:19), and *prostátēs* (1 Ch. 27:31[27:30c]; 29:6).[54]

II. Officialdom in the Ancient Near East.

1. *General Considerations.* In contrast to Israel's premonarchical society, the emergence of the monarchy resulted in an extensive centralization of power representing what M. Weber calls "enduring extra-domestic authority." Such centralization raises the question of the organization of power, since in order to be effectively represented everywhere, that central power must be delegated to a number of smaller authorities deriving their own relative power from the king. In the meantime, this newly emergent central authority comes to distribute power according to the model of the domestic sphere now transferred to the state. The result of this politicization of the domestic sphere (household) accompanying the emergent monarchy as the enduring form of authority has since Weber been called the "patrimonium." The patrimonium is essentially

49. See Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 58.

50. *HAL,* III, 1354b.

51. G. R. Driver, "Isaiah ix 5-6," *VT* 2 (1952) 357; Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 59.

52. *GK,* §85h; Joüon, §§88ff.

53. See the overview in Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 21.

54. On the list of officials inserted into 1 K. 2:46 LXX, see M. Rehm, "Die Beamtenliste der Septuaginta in 1 Kön 2,46h.," *Wort, Lied, und Gottespruch. FS J. Ziegler. FzB* 1-2 (1972), 1:95-101.

a transference of the principle of the domestic household onto a political organization and a resultant generation of nonfamilial authority (power).[55] The officials this process calls into being are initially recruited from the royal household and are then joined by additional officials with the expansion of the royal administration itself. These officials owe their status not to any particular kinship group but to their ties to the king. This process also generates a new social class existing alongside the earlier upper classes deriving from the tribal and clan organization. Social conflicts arise in that this new administrative upper class must be provided for or ultimately provides for itself by virtue of its position of power. In the ancient Near East, one characteristic of patrimonial officialdom is that the office is based on the privilege of the officeholder, not on that person's professional competence. Moreover, the spheres of responsibility of these officials are not clearly outlined, and as far as execution of office is concerned officials are bound not to laws but to the king.[56]

2. *Individual Manifestations.* a. *Egypt.* During the period of the Old Kingdom in Egypt, a bureaucracy developed for supporting the king in governing the empire. In the beginning the king transferred responsibilities to the members of his own family. Scribes later replaced these family members. Over sixteen hundred titles of officials are already attested in the Old Kingdom. At the head of this administration stood the vizier, who oversaw the judicial and executive branches, the administration and trade, was the highest judge, and also functioned as priest. He was not responsible for military matters.

In the Middle Kingdom the principle of office inheritance established itself with the result that only these officials ultimately took care of the administration. The position of vizier became so powerful that individual viziers sometimes even outlasted kings.

The overthrow of the Egyptian state by the Hyksos preceding the New Kingdom brought about an administrative change in the New Kingdom. The power of the vizier was repressed in favor of financial administrators, building supervisors, and generals. At the same time, the vizierate itself was divided into one for Upper Egypt with its seat in Thebes and one for Lower Egypt with its seat in Memphis.

Foreign countries occupied by Egypt were governed in different ways. In Nubia Egyptian officials held office in the fortresses. By contrast, in Syria-Palestine one finds no Egyptian officials; three commissioners were directly responsible to the pharaoh for these provinces to which the otherwise autonomous Syro-Canaanite city-states were assigned.

b. *Mesopotamia.* In Mesopotamia the administrative center was the palace found in the capital and provincial cities. Akkadian administrative documents enumerate a wide variety of titles and functions for officeholders. Because the areas of responsibility of these officials are not clearly delineated, however, the titles themselves reveal little about these offices. At the national level, one distinguished between the royal court,

---

55. Eder, 88.
56. Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 1ff.

which was responsible for palace and demesne administration, and the many local administrations. The fact that many administrative officials bear the title *ṭupšaru*, "scribe," derives from the requirement that these officials be able to write.

The king appointed city mayors. The Mari texts show that the king also confirmed the sheikhs of the nonsedentary tribes[57] and that the latter thus became royal officials with certain responsibilities to the king.[58]

In the Neo-Assyrian Empire the larger territorial expansion of the empire made the administrative structure considerably more complex. Administrative centers included the palace, temple, province, and city.

c. *Syria-Canaan.* In contrast to Egypt and Mesopotamia, in Syria-Canaan only smaller states existed whose administration in part was in the hands of a royal governor. Administrative spheres included the royal demesne, real estate transactions, judicial proceedings, the army, and finances. Royal dominion over villages manifested itself in the appointment of the mayor by the king.

Because of the wealth of documents, we are best informed about the administrative circumstances in the state of Ugarit.[59] Ugarit officials were considered "servants of the king,"[60] a situation still attesting the origin of the administration within the needs of the royal house administration as well as its orientation toward the king himself. The comprehensive term for all those serving the king was *bnš mlk*, "people of the king." These officials were divided into vocational groups all of which received their portion of natural goods, payment, and land. The highest official in Ugarit was the *skn*, "governor," "vizier"; governors were also found at the local level, where the royal administration coincided with local autonomy.

During the Amarna period, the Egyptian sphere of power was divided among three provinces: Canaan with its capital Gaza, Amurru with its capital Ṣumur, and Upu with its capital Kumidu.[61] Egyptian commissioners resided in the capitals to whom not only other Egyptian functionaries but also the indigenous city kings were subject. Elements of Egyptian rule in Syria-Canaan included tribute, forced labor, support of the army, and protection of trade and caravans.

III. Officialdom in Judah and Israel.

1. *Diachronic Overview.* In Israel the origin of officialdom within the royal house administration can similarly still be discerned. The earliest accounts speak about the king's → עבד *'eḇeḏ*, pl. *'ᵃḇāḏîm* who belonged to the king's *bayiṯ* (1 S. 22:6-7,9,14,17; 2 S. 9:2; 15:14-15,18,21). The title *śar* is mentioned only twice under Saul. His cousin

57. G. Dossin, *Correspondance de Iasmah-Addu. ARM* V (1952), 42-43, no. 24.

58. J. R. Kupper, *Correspondance de Kibri-Dagan, gouverneur de Terqa. ARM* III (1950), 40-41, no. 21; *Correspondance de Bahdi-Lim, prefét du palais de Mari. ARM* VI (1954), 52-53, no. 32.

59. See the overview by K. Engelken, "Kanaan als nicht-territorialer Terminus," *BN* 52 (1990) 56.

60. J. Nougayrol, *Textes accadiens des Archives Sud. PRU* IV (1956), 107-8, no. 17.238.

61. On this division see Moran, *Amarna Letters,* xxvi-xxvii.

Abner was commander-in-chief of the army and bore the title *śar haṣṣāḇā'* (1 S. 14:50; 26:5; 2 S. 2:8; cf. 2 S. 3:38; 1 K. 2:5,32), and according to 1 S. 22:14, David was the commander of his bodyguard with the title *śar 'el-mišma'aṯ*.

Saul's rule was still able to get by with a minimum of administrative organization. Under David's rule, however, with its accompanying expansion of royal dominion over a larger territorial state, which in contrast to Saul's rule encompassed all of Judah and Israel, one first encounters the emergence of officials, attested especially by lists that differentiate among important administrative offices (2 S. 8:15-18; 20:23-26).

This administrative apparatus was further expanded during the Solomonic period; royal officials are called *śārîm* for the first time in the Solomonic lists of officials (1 K. 4:2-6), which include the head of forced labor, the king's friend, the head of the palace, the majordomo, the head of the officials, the temple priests, and the commander of the army.[62]

With regard to the actual structuring of the royal administration under David and Solomon, scholars point out that until this period, Israel had no real experience with royal administration and thus had to adopt administrative models as well as administratively skilled personnel from elsewhere. Frequent reference is made in this context to the model of the pharaonic administration in Egypt with the implication that many of the offices emerging in Israel under the monarchy were adopted directly from Egypt or were mediated by Egyptian rule in Syria-Palestine during the Amarna period.[63] But this view overlooks the fact that during the Amarna period the Syro-Canaanite city-states had their own constitutions, that there were only three Egyptian governors in Syria-Canaan, and that no Egyptian administration was ever introduced there.[64] Syria-Canaan developed its own, independent administrative tradition influenced in part by Mesopotamian models, and this tradition did have an effect on administrative organization in Israel. Moreover, because Israel did not develop into an actual state until the 8th century,[65] administrative references in OT sources recounting administration conditions in the 10th-8th centuries probably reflect later conditions and thus are not historically reliable.

Neither do the sources provide reliable information about the training of officials in Israel. Analogy with Egypt and Mesopotamia,[66] as well as diverse epigraphic evidence (alphabetical lists, student texts, translation exercises) and OT references,[67] presupposes

62. Mettinger, 7-18; Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 71-91.

63. R. de Vaux, "Titres et fonctionnaires égyptiens à la cour de David et de Salomon," *RB* 48 (1939) 394-405; idem, *AncIsr,* 127-38; Begrich, "Sōfēr und Mazkīr," *GSAT. ThB* 21 (1964), 67-98 = *ZAW* 58 (1940/41) 1-29; A. Cody, *A History of OT Priesthood. AnBibl* 35 (1969), 93-96; Mettinger, 2-4, 45-51, 58-62, 107-10; Ahlström, 27-29, 32-33; Thiel, *Entwicklung,* 82 n. 47; idem, "Sozial Wandlungen," 243.

64. See II.2.c.

65. E. A. Knauf, *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* 19 (1989) 79-91, esp. 79-80, 82-83; D. W. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archeological Approach. JSOTSup* 109 (1991), esp. 22-23, 138-45.

66. → ספר *sōpēr,* X, 319-21.

67. B. Lang, "Schule und Unterricht im alten Israel," *Wie wird man Prophet in Israel?* (Düsseldorf, 1980), 104-19, esp. 106-10; A. Lemaire, *Les écoles et la formation de la Bible dans l'ancien Israël. OBO* 39 (1981), 7-71, 78-82; idem, "Sagesse et écoles," *VT* 34 (1984) 270-81;

the existence of royal scribal schools in the capitals of the southern and northern kingdoms, though also in a series of additional fortress and storage cities, schools in which future officials learned the basic skills of reading and writing.[68] Wisdom admonitions addressing officials with the goal of instilling group ethos, admonitions transmitted especially in the wisdom texts themselves, also suggest the presence of such schools.[69]

Other scholars believe that such scribes and officials were trained in their parents' home,[70] a view supported by the difficulty in demonstrating unequivocally the existence of such schools in preexilic Israel and by the hereditary nature of important administrative offices.

Still other scholars strike a certain compromise between the two positions by presupposing the existence of a school in Jerusalem for training administrative officials during the 8th-7th centuries from which officials were then dispatched to the various administrative centers throughout the country.[71]

Officials were provided for from the royal demesne, a process illustrated by the ostraca from Samaria,[72] perhaps also by ostraca from Lachish and Arad[73] and by certain OT texts (1 S. 8:14; 22:7; 2 S. 16:4; 19:30[29]). Here those particular social changes emerge that were generated by the existence of officialdom and can be explicated in greater detail with reference to the emergent taxation system and the phenomenon of pension capitalism.[74]

Recent studies on Israel's "land conquest" emphasizing the origin of Israel within Canaan[75] undermine the thesis of opposition between a Canaanite upper class and officialdom on the one hand, and an exploited Israelite population on the other.[76]

J. L. Crenshaw, "Education in Ancient Israel," *JBL* 104 (1985) 601-15; M. Haran, "On the Diffusion of Literacy and Schools in Ancient Israel," *Congress Volume, Jerusalem 1986. SVT* 40 (1988), 81-95; E. Puech, "Les écoles dans l'Israël préexilique," ibid., 189-203.

68. H.-J. Hermisson, *Studien zur israelitischen Spruchweisheit. WMANT* 28 (1968), 97-136; Mettinger, 140-57.

69. W. Richter, *Recht und Ethos. SANT* 15 (1966), 183-89.

70. F. W. Golka, "Die Israelitische Weisheitsschule oder 'des Kaisers neue Kleider,'" *VT* 33 (1983) 257-70; Lipiński, 161-64.

71. Jamieson-Drake, "Scribes," 147-57.

72. *KAI* 183-87.

73. *KAI* 199; Lemaire, *Inscriptions,* 155-221.

74. Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 125-38; O. Loretz, "Die prophetische Kritik des Rentenkapitalismus," *UF* 7 (1975) 271-78.

75. N. P. Lemche, *Early Israel: Anthropological and Historical Studies on the Israelite Society before the Monarchy. SVT* 37 (1985); B. Halpern, *The Emergence of Israel in Canaan. SBLMS* 29 (1983), esp. 47-63, 81-94; G. W. Ahlström, *Who Were the Israelites?* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1986); R. B. Coote and K. W. Whitelam, *The Emergence of Early Israel in Historical Perspective. SWBA* 5 (1987), esp. 117-38; K. W. Whitelam, "Israel's Traditions of Origin: Reclaiming the Land," *JSOT* 44 (1989) 19-42.

76. Cf. Donner, "Die soziale Botschaft," 230-35; W. Dietrich, *Israel und Kanaan. SBS* 94 (1979), 63-64, 91-92; H. Niehr, "Bedeutung und Funktion kanaanäischer Traditionselemente in der Sozialkritik Jesajas," *BZ* 28 (1984) 74-75; on analyses of the distinction between Israel and Canaan, esp. since the exilic period, cf. Dearman, 132-49; F. Stolz, *TRE,* XVII, 553-54; and on Canaan in general cf. esp. N. P. Lemche, *The Canaanites and Their Land. JSOTSup* 110 (1991).

A new social class emerged in Israelite society with the establishment of officialdom, one not deriving from the tribal or clan social order but still belonging to the upper classes. On the one hand, its power was based on a repression of the earlier tribal and clan social organization with its rule by elders, and on the other this officialdom occupied offices that did not exist prior to the monarchy. The result was that elders and officials together constituted the Israelite upper classes, as suggested by the parallel mention of *śar* and *zāqēn* (Jgs 8:14; 2 K. 10:1; Ezra 10:8; Ps. 105:22; Isa. 3:14; Lam. 5:12), by the fact that elders and especially officials were the object of prophetic social criticism (Isa. 1:23; 3:13-15; 5:23; 10:1-2; Jer. 34:10-11; Ezk. 22:6-7,27; Hos. 5:10; 9:15; Am. 5:10,12; Mic. 7:3; Zeph. 3:3; cf. Job 3:15; Ps. 82:7), and by the case of the family of Shaphan, in which elders and officials appear as members of the upper classes.[77]

The connection between city and officialdom is also of interest. The capital was the administrative center; officials received their directions from the capital, and the countryside had to orient itself toward the capital (cf. 2 S. 15:1-5),[78] a situation also applying to the provinces and provincial capitals established under Solomon.[79]

The Josianic reform prompted a further enhancement of both the military and officialdom, since royal power was to be strengthened by centralization. The administration also expanded to the judicial sphere with the incorporation of earlier titles,[80] though scholars are not in agreement regarding the extent to which these administrative measures were genuinely implemented under Josiah.[81]

2. *Administrative Offices.* a. *Palace Administration.* The story of Joseph clearly shows the role of the *śārîm* in connection with palace administration. In the various construct expressions appearing here, the term *śar* is to be understood as "head" or "overseer, supervisor."

Gen. 37:36 refers to Potiphar as one of Pharaoh's high officials *(s^e^rîs par'ōh)* and then mentions him in a second apposition as *śar haṭṭabbāḥîm* (cf. Gen. 39:1; 40:3-4; 41:10,12). The Aramaic loanword *ṭabbāḥîm* refers to the bodyguards,[82] whose *śar* is the captain, for which other synonyms include *raḇ ṭabbāḥîm* (2 K. 25:8,10-12,15, 18,20; Jer. 39:9-11,13; 40:1-2,5; 41:10; 43:6; 52:12,14-16,19,24,26,30). The expression *śar 'el-mišma'aṯ,* attested only in 1 S. 22:14, also refers to the captain of the guard. Gen. 39:20; 40:3-4; and 41:10 clearly show that the captain of the guard also supervised the prison. That his function was not limited to these duties is shown by his mention in the Dtr History and in Jeremiah, which portray the captain of the guard as the field commander responsible for taking Jerusalem.

---

77. Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 115-17; Clauss, *Gesellschaft,* 22, 31 n. 63.

78. Cf. in general Ahlström, 1-6; J. P. J. Olivier, "In Search of a Capital for the Northern Kingdom," *JNSL* 11 (1983) 121-26.

79. See H. N. Rösel, *ZDPV* 100 (1984) 84-90.

80. M. Sekine, "Beobachtungen zu der josianischen Reform," *VT* 22 (1972) 361-68; Niehr, *Rechtsprechung,* 87-101.

81. Buchholz, 83-100.

82. *LexLingAram,* 68.

Palace administration also includes the *śar bêṯ-hassōhar* (Gen. 39:21-23), the supervisor of the jail. Jer. 37:14-15 and 38:6 attest the authority of *śārîm* to incarcerate people.

Those responsible for taking care of the royal court include the *śar hammašqîm,* the "chief butler" (Gen. 40:2,9,20-23; 41:9), and the *śar hā'ôpîm,* the "chief baker" (40:2,16,20,22; 41:10).[83] Like the captain of the guard, they too are called "high officials" *(sārîs)* of Pharaoh (40:2,7), attesting their important political status. It was from Pharaoh that they derived the power transcending their mere titles. Although counterparts to these titles are not attested for Jerusalem and Samaria, one does appear as the Neo-Assyrian title *rab šāqē* (Heb. *raḇ-šāqēh*), "chief cupbearer."[84] Rather than being limited to responsibilities within the palace administration, the *raḇ-šāqēh* also played a part in diplomatic missions (2 K. 18:17-36). The person responsible for providing accommodations for the royal court on journeys was the *śar menûḥâ,* the "quartermaster" (Jer. 51:59).

According to 1 K. 14:27, palace security was entrusted to the *śārê hārāṣîm,* the "officers of the guard," who were the guard detachment that accompanied the king.[85]

b. *Forced Labor.* Officials involved in overseeing forced labor and the administration of the demesne include the *śārê missîm* (Ex. 1:11) and the *śārê hanniṣṣāḇîm* (1 K. 5:30[16]; 9:23). Whereas *śārê missîm* refers to the "supervisor of forced labor," 1 K. 5:30(16) and 9:23 refer to the officials involved with overseeing forced labor who were under the governors.[86]

c. *The Military.* In connection with the military, the *śar* refers to the leader of a unit or of the entire army. Here the use of *śar* as attested in nonmilitary contexts (1 S. 22:2; 2 S. 4:2; 1 K. 11:24) applies to the military context.

The military includes *śārîm* as leaders of various units whose size is indicated by numerical information. The OT decimal system of military organization is prefigured in the army organization of Ugarit as well as in the Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian Empire and is also attested in Elephantine. No concrete correspondence to the Israelite army organization can be discerned.[87] The army itself includes *śārê ʿaśārōṯ* (Ex. 18:21,25; Dt. 1:15), *śārê ḥamiššîm* (Ex. 18:21,25; Dt. 1:15; 1 S. 8:12; 2 K. 1:9-11,13-14; Isa. 3:3), *śārê (ham)mē'ôṯ* (Ex. 18:21,25; Nu. 31:14,48,52,54; Dt. 1:15; 1 S. 22:7; 2 S. 18:1; 2 K. 11:4,9-10,15,19; 1 Ch. 13:1; 26:26; 27:1; 28:1; 29:6; 2 Ch. 1:2; 23:1,9,14,20; 25:5), comparable with Phoen. and Pun. *rb m't,*[88] and *śārê (hā)'ălāpîm* (Ex. 18:21,25; Nu. 31:14,48,52,54; Dt. 1:15; 1 S. 8:12; 17:18; 18:13; 22:7; 2 S. 18:1; 1 Ch. 13:1; 15:25; 26:26; 27:1; 28:1; 29:6; 2 Ch. 1:2; 17:14; 25:5).

---

83. See in this regard E. Mazar, *IEJ* 37 (1987) 62.

84. *AHw,* III, 1182.

85. E. Würthwein, *Das erste Buch der Könige 1–16. ATD* 11/1 (1976), 184.

86. M. Noth, *Könige (1–16). BK* IX/1 (²1983), 85, 200; J. Gray, *I & II Kings. OTL* (²1970), 156; Würthwein, *Könige 1–16,* 52, 109.

87. Cf. in this regard Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 27-30; L. Perlitt, *Deuteronomium. BK* V (1990), 70-71.

88. *KAI* 101.2; A. Lemaire, "Notes d'épigraphie nord-ouest sémitique," *Sem* 30 (1980) 17-19.

No numerical information accompanies the mention of *śārê (ha)ḥayil/haḥªyālîm* (2 S. 24:2,4; 1 K. 15:20; 2 K. 9:5; 25:23,26; 2 Ch. 16:4; 33:14; Neh. 2:9; Jer. 40:7,13; 41:11,13,16; 42:1,8; 43:4-5) as "officers" or "commanders" and *śār(ê) (hā)reḵeḇ* (1 K. 9:22; 16:9; 22:31-33; 2 K. 8:21; 2 Ch. 8:9; 18:30-32; 21:9) as "chariot commanders."

The commander of the army bears the title *śar (haṣ)ṣāḇā'* (Gen. 21:22,32; 26:26; Jgs. 4:2,7; 1 S. 12:9; 14:50; 17:55; 26:5; 2 S. 2:8; 10:16,18; 19:14[13]; 1 K. 1:19,25 [*BHS*]; 2:32; 11:15,21; 16:16; 2 K. 4:13; 5:1; 25:19; 1 Ch. 19:16,18; 27:5,34; Jer. 52:25), a title also attested in the Lachish ostraca.[89] The corresponding plural form *śārê haṣṣāḇā',* "army commanders," "officers," is attested in 1 Ch. 25:1; 26:26; 2 Ch. 33:11, and the plural form *śārê ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* in Dt. 20:9; 1 K. 2:5; 1 Ch. 27:3. 2 K. 25:19[90] and Jer. 52:25 mention the "secretary of the commander of the army who mustered the people of the land."

d. *Local and Provincial Administration.* The governor of city administration appointed by the king was the *śar hā'îr* (Jgs. 9:30; 1 K. 22:26; 2 K. 23:8; 2 Ch. 18:25; 34:8), a title also attested on Hebrew bullae from Jerusalem.[91] As shown by Jgs. 9:30; 1 K. 22:26; and 2 Ch. 34:8, the *śar hā'îr* serves and is loyal to the king. This office has thus far been attested only in Shechem, Samaria, and Jerusalem, i.e., in the capitals with their royal administration.

These officials are to be distinguished from a city's *śārîm* (2 K. 10:1; 2 Ch. 29:20; Isa. 1:23; Jer. 26:10-12,16; 29:2; 34:10,19; Lam. 1:6; Ezk. 17:22; 22:27; Zeph. 3:3), who were part of the local royal administration, which had displaced the old self-administration of the city that was based on a rule of elders. The responsibilities of these royal officials in the city administration emerge indirectly from the charges brought against them by the prophets' social criticism, which include the perversion of justice (Isa. 1:21-23; cf. 10:1-2) and exploitation (Ezk. 22:27; Zeph. 3:3).

At the level of provincial administration, too, officials serve to protect royal interests, a duty applying in both the northern and the southern kingdoms. In the northern kingdom the *na'ªrê śārê hammᵉḏînôṯ* are mentioned in connection with the Aramean wars (1 K. 20:14-15,17,19), a reference to the troops[92] under the command of the regional governor, which means that as governors of the provinces of the northern kingdom the *śārîm* also had military responsibilities. Because the term *mᵉḏînâ*[93] otherwise occurs only in postexilic texts, one can assume that 1 K. 20 is also following this late usage[94] and does not provide information about the administrative structure of the northern kingdom.

The *śārê yᵉhûḏâ* are first mentioned in Hos. 5:10 in connection with the Syro-Ephraimite War, where they are reproached for having expanded the territory of the

---

89. *KAI* 193.14.
90. Concerning the text cf. *BHS;* also Mettinger, 20-21.
91. See I.2.e above.
92. → נער *na'ar,* IX, 482, §III.3.b.
93. → דין *dîn,* III, 190, §I.3.c.
94. E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige. 1. Kön 17–2. Kön 25. ATD* 11/2 (1984), 239.

southern kingdom toward the north.[95] These *śārê yᵉhûḏâ* refer to military personnel and to royal officials.[96]

The *śārê yᵉhûḏâ* do not appear again until the early exilic prophecy in the southern kingdom. In connection with Jeremiah's temple sermon, they come up to the temple from the royal palace in Jerusalem (Jer. 26:10), listen to the quarrel between the priests, prophets, and Jeremiah (vv. 11-12), and decide in favor of Jeremiah (v. 16). In 26:1-19 the *śārîm* refer to officials of both Judah and Jerusalem rather than merely to the provincial officials in contrast to those in the capital, a point also suggested by the parallel mention of the officials of Judah and Jerusalem in 29:2 and 34:19, and by the mention of officials parallel to the king and priests in 1:18. By contrast, 26:21 mentions officials in the immediate entourage of the king in the Uriah narrative; these same officials may be the intended reference in 37:15 and 38:4-6 as well.

e. *Legal Adjudication.* The emergence of the royal administration made it necessary to resolve legal cases arising because of this administration, and this task was the responsibility of a royal administrative legal authority whose beginnings are recounted in 2 S. 15:1-5. Until the time of Josiah, there were no officials who functioned as judges. The royal administrative judiciary was composed of the *śārîm,* as shown by mention of the legal cases brought before them or by their role in adjudication (Isa. 1:23; 10:1-2; Jer. 26:10-16; 37:15; 38:4-6; Hos. 5:1; Mic. 3:1,9,11). As extrabiblical evidence for adjudication by a *śar,* one can adduce the ostracon of Meṣad Ḥashavyahu.[97] The *śr* mentioned here as a judicial authority is a military governor of the Josianic or immediately post-Josianic period[98] who was responsible for the jurisdiction of a royal fortress and its surroundings. His functions included supervision of forced labor, legal matters, and the administration of the garrison.[99]

3. *Reflection in Literature.* The existence of officials during Israel's monarchy also influenced literature to the extent the title *śar* was transferred to foreign circumstances and projected back onto Israel's own premonarchical period.

The powerful servants and officials of foreign rulers are designated in a blanket fashion as *śārîm.* Hence authors refer to the *śārîm* of Egypt (Isa. 19:11,13; Jer. 25:19), Moab (Nu. 22:8,13-15,21,35,40; 23:6,17; Am. 2:3), Edom (Isa. 34:12), Midian (Jgs. 7:25; 8:3), Ammon (2 S. 10:3; 1 Ch. 19:3; Jer. 49:3; Am. 1:15), Assyria (Isa. 10:8; 31:9), Babylon (2 Ch. 32:31; Jer. 38:17-18,22; 39:3; 50:35; 51:57), Elam (Jer. 49:38), and the Philistines (1 S. 18:30; 29:3-4,9). Because these references actually constitute

---

95. A. Alt, "Hosea 5,8–6,6. Ein Krieg und seine Folgen in prophetischer Beleuchtung," *KlSchr,* II (1953), 172-73; J. Jeremias, "'Mein Gott, warum hast du mich verlassen — !' (Ps 22,2)," in N. Lohfink, ed., *"Ich will euer Gott werden": Beispiele biblischen Redens von Gott. SBS* 100 (1981), 85-86; idem, *Hosea,* 81.

96. Alt, "Hosea 5,8–6,6," 171 n. 3; 173 n. 1.

97. *KAI* 200.

98. See R. Wenning, "Meṣad-Ḥašavyāhū," in F.-L. Hossfeld, ed., *Vom Sinai zum Horeb* (Würzburg, 1989), 169-96.

99. Lemaire, *Inscriptions,* 261-62; D. Pardee, "The Judicial Plea from Meṣad Ḥashavyahu (Yavneh-Yam)," *Maarav* 1 (1978) 38-40; Y. Suzuki, *AJBI* 8 (1982) 33-38, 40-41.

an *interpretatio israelitica* of foreign conditions, they do not offer reliable information about the various administrative forms.[100]

Projection of the *śar* title back onto premonarchical Israelite circumstances in Palestine represents a characteristic anachronism of the book of Judges. The Song of Deborah (Jgs. 5:15) mentions the *śārê bᵉyiśśāsḵār (BHS),* the "chiefs of Issachar."[101] This use of *śar* more closely resembles that in 1 S. 22:2; 2 S. 4:2; and 1 K. 11:24 in the sense of "leader of a host." A similarly comparable passage is Jgs. 10:18 with its mention of the *śārê gilʿāḏ,* which probably represents a later addendum to the text (cf. *BHS*). The translation of Jgs. 5:15 as "prince"[102] imports false structures into tribal organization.

Jgs. 8:6 and 14 mention the *śārîm* of the city of Succoth in Transjordan but do not mention a king. In vv. 14 and 16 these officials parallel "the elders" so that the *śārîm* here anachronistically represent the earlier council of "men of the city."[103]

Reference to a *śar hāʿîr* for Shechem during the period prior to statehood (Jgs. 9:30) also represents a projection back from the period of the monarchy, when royal city governors are attested only for Jerusalem and Samaria.

None of these references to the *śar* in the book of Judges reflects the existence of an office of *śar* during the period preceding statehood.

IV. Exilic and Postexilic Officialdom.

1. *Diachronic Overview.* The exile brought with it the fall of the monarchy and the elimination of royal officialdom. First of all the officials, like other members of the upper classes, are charged with having fallen away from faith in Yahweh (Jer. 1:18; 2:26; 8:1-3; 32:32; 44:17,21; cf. already Hos. 9:15). The officials either perished in the country (Jer. 4:9; 24:8-10; 25:18; 34:19-20,21; Lam. 1:6; 2:2; 5:12), fled (2 K. 25:26), or went into exile (Jer. 24:1; 29:2; Lam. 2:9; Ezk. 17:12), where they also perished (Jer. 52:10). It is difficult to determine who from the upper classes remained in the country (cf. 2 K. 24:14; 25:12). Among the exiles, the elders once again came to the forefront (Jer. 29:1; Ezk. 8:1; 14:1; 20:1), and the renewed importance of the elders as a leadership council can be demonstrated for Palestine as well.[104] The high priest's de facto assumption of the role of the king during the postexilic period represented, albeit to a lesser degree, a revival of officialdom for internal administration of the Jewish civil and temple community. Because that community was under foreign rule, foreign officials now also entered the picture.

The Achaemenid administration was based on a division of the empire into provinces organized into satrapies; the provincial governors of the satrapies were responsi-

---

100. On the text-critical difficulties accompanying Jer. 39:3, cf. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 244-45; D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'AT. OBO* 50/2 (1986), 725-28.

101. On the text see J. A. Soggin, *Judges. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1972), 89.

102. J. de Fraine, *Rechters. BOT* (1955), 43; Soggin, *Judges,* 82.

103. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, 238-43; E. A. Knauf, *Midian. Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* (Wiesbaden, 1988), 39-40.

104. Buchholz, 32-42.

ble to the high king. Although *ad intra* these provinces could govern themselves autonomously, they had to remain in accord with the central authorities.[105]

The internal administrative structure of Judah is difficult to discern on the basis of OT information. Around 518 B.C.E., the satrap of Transeuphrates (NRSV "governor of the province Beyond the River") was still dealing with the elders (Ezra 5:3-5). Over time, however, these elders recede as a council. The book of Nehemiah no longer mentions them at all, and we read rather about the *s^eg̱ānîm* as heads of the community. Ezra recounts the appointment of judges (Ezra 7:25). A *śar habbîrâ* is mentioned under Nehemiah as the commander of the citadel (Neh. 7:2) who together with Nehemiah's brother was appointed commander of Jerusalem (7:1-3). Judah was divided into precincts (3:1-32) subject to *śārîm*. Under the Ptolemies, the (financial) administration of Syria-Palestine was significantly tightened, leading to the emergence of an indigenous upper class alongside the priestly nobility.[106]

According to Neh. 5, one group of nobles differentiated itself from the people at large. Within this group, the leading families constituted the upper class.[107]

2. *Reflection in Literature.* a. *Pentateuch.* Exilic and postexilic passages in the Pentateuch transfer the title *śar* onto the tribal organization of the premonarchical period (Ex. 18; Nu. 31; Dt. 1:15). The context of this transference is actually a hearkening back to Israel's premonarchical period and a simultaneous idealization of that epoch; this retrospective is introduced by the restorative tendencies accompanying the Josianic reform and is continued during the exilic-postexilic period with renewed interest in the figure of Moses.[108] The sociohistorical and political background was the exilic loss of independence and the transition to the postexilic civil and temple community that awakened interest in Israel's existence prior to or unconnected with statehood.[109]

According to Ex. 18, Jethro advises Moses to select able men from the people to function as *śārîm* "over thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens" (v. 21) and to sit as judges (v. 22). Moses follows this advice (vv. 25-26). Although scholars agree that the purpose of this text is to legitimize the institution of officers already functioning as judges during the premonarchical period by ascribing it to Moses, they do not agree on when to date the text. Dating suggestions include the time of David and Solomon[110] of Jehoshaphat,[111] of

105. Weinberg, 36-38; Frei; concerning the political structure, cf. McEvenue, 353-64.

106. P. Schäfer, 29-38.

107. Schottroff, 119-22, 135-36.

108. H. Schmid, *Die Gestalt des Mose: Probleme alttestamentlicher Forschung unter Berücksichtigung der Pentateuchkrise. EdF* 237 (1986), 99.

109. See E. Zenger, *Das Buch Ruth. ZBK* 8 (1992), 28.

110. H. Reviv, "The Traditions Concerning the Inception of the Legal System in Israel," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 566-75; C. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, "Exodus 18 — Zur Begründung königlicher Gerichtsbarkeit in Israel-Juda," *DBAT* 21 (1985) 61-85.

111. W. F. Albright, "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat," *FS A. Marx* (New York, 1950), 61-82; R. Knierim, "Exodus 18 und die Neuordnung der mosaischen Gerichtsbarkeit," *ZAW* 73 (1961) 146-71; G. C. Macholz, "Zur Geschichte der Justizorganisation in Juda," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 314-40.

Josiah,[112] and the Persian period.[113] Indications of military participation in judicial responsibility can be adduced for the time of Josiah,[114] making it possible to set a *terminus post quem* for dating Ex. 18. The military organization of the people during the wilderness wanderings suggests late Dtr redaction.[115]

Dt. 1:9-18 picks up Ex. 18. According to v. 15, Moses is to install tribal leaders as *śārîm* over thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens; these leaders will now function as judges in conducting trials and adjudicating (vv. 16-17). In contrast to Ex. 18, in Dt. 1:13 it is the people who are to choose these leaders. The military model recedes, and the royal officials and the judges mentioned in Dt. 16:18-20 and 17:8-13 are now taken as the model.[116] In contrast to Nu. 11, both Ex. 18 and Dt. 1 emphasize the *śārîm* within a forensic context, while Nu. 11 emphasizes the role of the elders.[117]

Nu. 31:14,48,52,54 mention the leaders of thousands and hundreds, whom the terminology of the surrounding context suggests one understand in the military sense. The context is the war against the Midianites, which the Israelite army won, emerging unscathed and with rich spoils. The broader context of Nu. 31 involves the postexilic view of Moses as the lawgiver who dispenses instructions regarding the destruction of spoils after a Yahweh war,[118] and the motif of the "'evil' Midianites" bringing to expression the negative experiences the postexilic civil and temple community had with the Arabs.[119]

The parallel between *śar* and *nāḏîḇ* in Nu. 21:18 refers to Israel's upper classes during the wilderness period. Here language usage also found in Chronicles and in postexilic wisdom literature is projected back onto the premonarchial period.

b. *Esther.* The book of Esther mentions the royal administration of Persia several times. Alongside specialized Persian terminology from Achaemenid administrative language, one also encounters Heb. *śar,* though its use is in part so imprecise that an exact understanding is probably not possible. The construct expression *śārê hammᵉḏînôṯ* (Est. 1:3; 8:9; 9:3) in reference to the provincial governor, an expression also used in 1 K. 20:14-15,17,19, presents no problems. Est. 8:9 and 9:3 use the title parallel with *peḥâ.* In 8:9 mention of the satraps, to whom the governors were subject, precedes that of the other two officials, whereas in 9:3 the satraps follow the *śārîm.* In 3:12 the title *śārê 'am* (cf. Ezk. 11:1) similarly parallels *peḥâ,* though one cannot determine whether here too the reference is to governors. When the king and his *śārîm* are mentioned and the latter parallel *'eḇeḏ,* the reference is probably to officials (Est. 1:3; 2:18; 5:11). In

---

112. Junge, 56-58; M. Sekine, *VT* 22 (1972) 361-68.

113. Buchholz, 97-98; Knauf, 157-58.

114. Niehr, *Rechtsprechung,* 91-94.

115. M. Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist. ATANT* 67 (1981), 229ff.

116. G. Braulik, *Deuteronomium 1–16:17. NEB* (1986), 24; Perlitt, *Deuteronomium,* 58-61, 70ff.

117. J. G. Plöger, *Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium. BBB* 26 (1967), 31-35; S. Mittmann, *Deuteronomium 1:1–6:3 literarkritisch und traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht. BZAW* 139 (1975), 26-33; Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist,* 224-57; H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 80; Buchholz, 98.

118. Schmid, *Gestalt des Mose,* 76-77.

119. Knauf, 160-61, 165-66.

1:18 *śārê hammeleḵ* refers to the seven princes of Persia and Media also mentioned in 1:14 with their full title as *śārê pāras ûmāḏay.* In 1:18 their wives bear the title *śārôṯ.* The princes in 1:11,16,21; 3:1; and 6:9 also bear the title *śar.*

The imprecise and in part pleonastic use of the title *śar* corresponds to other observations about the book of Esther.[120] As far as the title *śar* is concerned, one can say that it refers in a general fashion to officials without associating a specific office with them.[121]

c. *Daniel.* The book of Daniel also uses the title *śar* to refer to various administrative positions associated with Persian rule. Dnl. 1:7-11,18 use the title *śar hassārîsîm* six times to refer to the head of the courtiers, a person otherwise called the *raḇ hassārîsîm* (1:13) or the *raḇ sārîs* (2 K. 18:17; Jer. 39:3,13).[122]

Dnl. 11:5 mentions one of the *śārîm* of the king of the south in a reference to the founder of the Seleucid dynasty.[123]

With reference to Israel in his parable (9:3-14), Daniel calls the upper classes of preexilic Israel the *m^e^lāḵênû śārênû wa'ᵃḇōṯênû* (vv. 6,8). No specific meaning of *śar* can be determined from this passage.

d. *Chronicler's History.* The use of the title *śar* in the Chronicler's History exhibits two characteristics. The first is a tendency to refer to all possible leadership positions with the title *śar.*[124] The other is the lack of distinction between tribal and clan organization on the one hand, and the state organization on the other.[125] This situation leads to the coining of new designations and to a semantic ambiguity in the use of *śar* itself.

New constructions can be discerned in designations of leadership positions in vocational groups (priests: 2 Ch. 36:14; Ezra 8:24,29; 10:5; Levites: 1 Ch. 15:16,22; 2 Ch. 35:9), social groups (the people: 1 Ch. 21:2; 2 Ch. 24:23; Neh. 11:1; Israel: 1 Ch. 22:17; 23:2; 28:1; 2 Ch. 21:4; Judah: 2 Ch. 12:5; 22:8; 24:17; Neh. 12:31-32; clan: 1 Ch. 12:29[28]; 15:5-10; 29:6), and local entities (citadel: Neh. 7:2; precinct: Neh. 3:9,12,14-19; sanctuary: 1 Ch. 24:5). The term *śar* can also refer to supervisors in the general sense or to the leading circles or upper classes (1 Ch. 19:3; 2 Ch. 12:5-6; 24:10,23; 28:14; 29:20; 36:14; Ezra 9:1-2; 10:8,14; Neh. 10:1[9:38]), something also expressed by *śārê hā'ām* (1 Ch. 21:2; Neh. 11:1; cf. Est. 3:12; Ezk. 11:1). The *śar* can also be the leader of a specific undertaking (1 Ch. 15:27; 29:6; 2 Ch. 8:10) or the stewards of a person's property (1 Ch. 27:31; 28:1; cf. Gen. 47:6).

The term *śar* is also used synonymously with the leadership title so popular in the Chronicler's History, → ראשׁ *rō'š,*[126] making it difficult to distinguish between military and tribal or clan use of *śar.*

---

120. G. Gerleman, *Esther. BK* XXI (²1982), 35-36.
121. Ibid., 53.
122. See also *DNSI,* II, 804.
123. Koch, *Daniel,* 189; J.-C. Lebram, *Das Buch Daniel. ZBK* 23 (1984), 118.
124. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, 250.
125. Rüterswörden, *Beamten,* 46-47, 145.
126. See in this regard J. R. Bartlett, "The Use of the Word ראשׁ as a Title in the OT," *VT* 19 (1969) 7-8.

At the same time, *śar* retains many of its earlier designative functions in the sphere of administration, where *śar* is to be understood as "official" (1 Ch. 24:6; 29:24; 2 Ch. 17:7; 21:9; 23:13; 28:21; 29:30; 30:2,6,12,24; 31:8; 35:8; 36:18; Ezra 7:28; 8:20,25; Neh. 9:32,34), and in the military sphere, where *śar* refers to an officer (1 Ch. 11:6,21; 12:22[21]; 13:1; 15:25; 19:16,18; 25:1; 26:26; 27:1,3,5,34; 28:1; 29:6; 2 Ch. 1:2; 16:4; 17:14-15; 21:9; 23:1,9,14,20; 25:5; 26:11; 28:14; 32,3,6,21; 33:11,14; Neh. 2:9; 4:10).[127] New military expressions include *śar šālîšim* (2 Ch. 8:9) and *śārê milḥāmôṯ* (2 Ch. 32:6).

1 Ch. 12:35(34); 27:22; 28:1; 29:6 show that the Chronicler's History anachronistically projects the *śārîm* back to the tribes of premonarchical Israel.

e. *Psalms.* In the Psalms the *śārîm* refer in a general sense to the "upper classes" (45:17[16]; 68:28[27]; 82:7; 105:22; 119:23,161; 148:11).

f. *Wisdom.* The title *śar* occurs in the wisdom books of Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes with the familiar meanings.

In Job 3:15; 29:9; 34:19, pl. *śārîm* refers to the upper classes, while in 39:25 the context suggests understanding the title *śar* as a military leader.

When referring to the upper classes in Proverbs, *śar* refers especially to "rulers." Prov. 8:16 parallels *mᵉlāḵîm yimlᵉḵû* (v. 15) with the expression *śārîm yāśōrû.* The vb. *śārar* means "rule"[128] and is used synonymously here with *mālaḵ,* while *śār* itself parallels *meleḵ.* Just as in this passage, so also in 28:2 *śar* refers to the rulers of a country.[129]

Prov. 19:10, like Eccl. 10:7, presupposes opposition between *śar* and *ʿeḇeḏ,* terms referring to the two ends of the social hierarchy.

In contrast to Prov. 8:15-16, the parallel of *śar* and *meleḵ* in Eccl. 10:16-17 is to be understood as a relationship of subordination.

V. Theological Considerations.

1. *People.* The first step toward using the title *śar* with theological implications occurs in connection with the sanctuary.

The textually difficult addendum Isa. 43:28[130] mentions the *śārê qōḏeš,* the "princes of the sanctuary," a designation also found in the textually reliable 1 Ch. 24:5. The text in Chronicles qualifies the *śārê qōḏeš* as *śārê ʾᵉlōhîm,* who here involve descendants of Eleazar and Ithamar, the surviving sons of Aaron who had taken over the priesthood from him. The *śārê qōḏeš* refer to the heads of the service classes.[131] Isa. 43:28 refers similarly to the priestly classes.[132]

127. On Neh. 4:10 cf. *BHS* and A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Nehemia. KAT* XIX/2 (1987), 51, 77; concerning military organization in Chronicles, see P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern. WMANT* 42 (1973), 79-114.

128. See 1.5.d.

129. On the text cf. *BHS;* W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 630-31.

130. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 362-63.

131. J. Becker, *1 Chronik. NEB* (1986), 95.

132. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja,* 386-87.

The title *śar* is used in an eschatological context to qualify the messianic figure of Isa. 9:5(6). The construct expression *śar šālôm,* attested only here, should not be associated too hastily with the office of the Egyptian vizier.[133] The traditional and hitherto widespread translation "prince of peace" is hardly adequate.[134] A negative reading of this passage as "prince of requital/tribute" is also questionable.[135] The term *šālôm* more likely refers to general well-being than to the more restricted sense of "peace"[136] such that one can understand *śar šālôm* to refer to a kind of welfare official,[137] a title also commensurate with the other titles of officials *yôʿēṣ* and *gibbôr* in Isa. 9:5(6) and that is to be understood against the ideological background of the salvific king (cf. Ps. 72:1-17; Isa. 11:1-9).

2. *Celestial Hierarchy.* The *śar* acquires additional theological coloring in the transference of the title to the heavenly council. The few OT witnesses to this use are found in the books of Joshua and Daniel; the notion undergoes further development in the Qumran writings.

Josh. 5:13-15 relates Joshua's vision in which an angel with a sword appears to him calling himself the *śar ṣᵉḇāʾ yhwh* and summoning Joshua to remove his shoes, "for the place where you stand is holy" (vv. 14-15).[138] The application of the title *śar* to the heavenly hosts suggests that those hosts are organized militarily.

As far as the age of this notion is concerned, one can probably not date it very early,[139] since the context attests later traditions and includes the understanding of Yahweh's heavenly council that was not fully developed until the postexilic period.

This understanding of the heavenly hosts as organized militarily is also found in Dnl. 10:13, which refers to Michael as one of the first *śārîm,* and in 12:1, where he appears as *haśśar haggāḏôl* for Israel. In these texts Michael functions as a protector of Israel. In analogy to the protective prince of Israel, the text also speaks about the protective warrior *śārîm* of Persia (10:13,20) and Greece (10:20). A comparable notion is the division of nations according to the number of gods familiar from Dt. 32:8-9 (cf. also Dt. 4:19-20; Sir. 17:17) or the idea of the sons of the gods, appearing here again with more independence.[140] In contrast to Dt. 32:8-9, according to

---

133. Contra R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–12. NEB* (1986), 74.

134. Contra H. H. Schmid, *Šalôm. "Frieden" im Alten Orient und im AT. SBS* 51 (1971), 73-74; H. Wildberger, "Die Thronnamen des Messias, Jes. 9,5b," *Jahwe und Sein Volk. ThB* 66 (1979), 60-61; idem, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 385, 405; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1983), 204.

135. G. Gerleman, "Die Wurzel *šlm,*" *ZAW* 85 (1973) 10; "שׁלם *šlm* to have enough," *TLOT,* III, 1345.

136. F. Horst, "Die Formen des althebräischen Liebesliedes," *Gottes Recht. ThB* 12 (1961), 194-95; H. Barth, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit. WMANT* 48 (1977), 170.

137. A. Alt, "Jesaja 8,23–9,6: Befreiungsnacht und Krönungstag," *KlSchr,* II (1953), 219.

138. On the context see J. A. Soggin, *Joshua. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1972), 76-78.

139. Contra P. D. Miller Jr., *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel. HSM* 5 (1973), 128-31; cf. M. Weippert's review of Miller, *Bibl* 57 (1976) 129-30.

140. See G. Cooke, "The Sons of (the) God(s)," *ZAW* 76 (1964) 43.

Dnl. 10:13 and 12:1 Michael has taken the place of Yahweh as Israel's protective prince.

The context of Dnl. 8:11 within which the *śar haṣṣāḇā'* is mentioned involves the temple and sacrifices. To that extent, *śar* refers to God.[141] An interpretation of the text as referring to Michael, who stands over the Jerusalem temple and its cult, is improbable.[142] This text represents an addendum from the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.[143]

Dnl. 8:25 refers to God with the title *śar śārîm;* here the title resonates with the Akkadian title used to refer to the Persian kings, *šar šarrāni,* in the sense of "high king."[144]

VI. Qumran. The title *śar* occurs in the Qumran writings in a series of isolated passages in various documents and then especially in CD (6 times), 11QT (10 times), and 1QM (13 times). From the various OT contexts and connotations associated with the title *śar* in the OT, the Qumranites picked up especially on its military dimension, something evident in the use of *śārîm* familiar from OT documents as those over the thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (1QSa 1:14-15,29; 1QM 3:16-17; 4:1-5; 11QT 22:2; 42:15; 57:4-5; 58:4). 11QT 62:5 refers to the troop commanders. The tribal leaders of Israel similarly bear the title *śar* (1QM 5:1-2), though they also bear the title → **נשׂיא** *nāśî'* (1QM 3:3,15), which demonstrates the exchangeability of *śar* and *nāśî'* in Qumran.[145]

Other occurrences of the title *śar* in the Qumran literature either cite or otherwise interpret OT passages (CD 6:3,6; 19:15; 20:16; 4QpPs 37:3,5,7; 1QpHab 4:3), a situation also applying to passages that understand the *śar* as "leader" (CD 8:3; 4QpNah 2:9).

Within the context of the Qumran-Essene community organization, 1QSa 1:24 mentions the office of the *śārîm* after the model of Dt. 1:15 parallel to judges and officers.

Specifically Qumran-Essene diction and theology are manifested in the reference to the "prince of light" (*śr m'wr:* 1QM 13:10; *śr [h]'wrym:* 1QS 3:20; CD 5:18). His counterpart, Belial, also bears the title "prince of the kingdom of wickedness" (*śr mmšlt rš'h:* 1QM 17:5-6).[146] In the Qumran Essenes' doctrine of light-darkness, the title "prince of light" refers to the angel who leads the "children of righteousness" (1QS 3:20) and whom 1QM 17:6 understands as the angel Michael.[147] The term *śar* also occurs as an angel designation in 1QM 13:14; 1QH 6:14.

The title *śar* is applied to God in 1QH 10:8, which refers to God as the *śr 'ylym,*

---

141. J. A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel. ICC* (1927), 335; O. Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1965), 126.

142. Koch, *Daniel,* 207.

143. Lebram, *Daniel,* 95, 100.

144. Seux, 318-19.

145. J. van der Ploeg, *Le rouleau de la guerre. STDJ* 2 (1959), 87.

146. See in this regard P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran. SUNT* 6 (1969), 116-20.

147. Ibid., 95-100.

"prince of gods," and as *mlk nkbdym,* "king of majesties." 1QM 17:6-7 uses the subst. *miśrâ,* "rule," occurring in the OT only in Isa. 9:5-6(6-7), to refer Michael's rule; the term also occurs in 1QM 13:4, where Belial is cursed for his wicked rule.

The vb. *śārar* has not yet been attested in the Qumran writings. Despite the orthography with *ś* in the formulation *śr 'prym m'l yhwdh* (CD 7:13), one must assume a form of the vb. *sûr,* "deviate, fall away."

Niehr

שָׂרִיד *śārîḏ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology and Basic Meaning; 2. Contextual Semantic Considerations; 3. LXX. II. "Remnant": 1. Annihilation; 2. Rescue.

I. 1. *Etymology and Basic Meaning.* Considering Arab. *šrd,* "take fright, shy, run away," and Syr. *srd,* "be terrified,"[1] one can probably assume that the original meaning of the Hebrew root *śrd* was "escape" or something similar, a meaning possibly still preserved in the paronomastic combination *haśśᵉrîḏîm śārᵉḏû,* "the refugees who had escaped" (Josh. 10:20; but see below), and in the idiom *śᵉrîḏê ḥereḇ,* "those who escaped the sword" (Jer. 31:2). Although some dictionaries and commentaries wholly maintain this meaning,[2] it does not do justice to most passages. The term underwent a semantic shift one can still discern in that in many cases those who escaped a catastrophe by fleeing represented the entire surviving remnant of a given population group, whence the term synecdochically took on the meaning "remnant, survivors," while the original semantic feature of flight and escape now receded or was lost entirely.

2. *Contextual Semantic Considerations.* The meaning "remnant" clearly emerges when the word is associated syntagmatically with the hiphil verbal forms *hôṯîr* and

---

śārîḏ. G. H. Davies, "Remnant," in A. Richardson, ed., *A Theological Wordbook of the Bible* (New York, 1962), 188-91; F. Dreyfus, "Remnant," in X. Leon-Dufour, ed., *Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (Eng. trans., New York, 1973), 484-86; H. Gross, "Rest," in J. B. Bauer, ed., *Bibeltheologisches Wörterbuch,* II (Graz, ³1967), 1190-93; G. F. Hasel, *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah. Andrews Univ. Monographs* 5 (1972), esp. 314ff., 386-87; J. Hausmann, *Israels Rest. BWANT* 124 (1987), esp. 198-202; E. Jenni, "Remnant," *IDB,* IV, 32-33; N. Na'aman, "Literary and Topographical Notes on the Battle of Kishon (Judges IV–V)," *VT* 40 (1990) 423-36, esp. 423-26; E. Osterloh, "Rest," in idem and H. Engelland, eds., *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch* (Göttingen, 1964), 494; J. Paterson, "Remnant," *HDB,* 841-42; → פלט *pālaṭ,* XI, 551-67.

1. *GesB,* 792; *BDB,* 974.

2. *GesB,* 792; B. Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob. KHC* XVI (1897), 108: "*śārîḏ* cannot be 'remnant' while otherwise it always refers to the person who has escaped."

hiš'îr, "leave over," which is the case in 9 of the 28 relevant passages (e.g., Dt. 2:34; Isa. 1:9). One can also include the contexts discussed below that speak of a *śārîḏ* living in some accommodation or even of the *śārîḏ* of an inanimate object. Jerusalem, as the only unscathed city in the land otherwise decimated by the Assyrians, has been abandoned by Yahweh as a *śārîḏ* (Isa. 1:9). The wicked ultimately have no *śārîḏ* in the places where they used to live (Job 18:19), or fire will consume this *śārîḏ* in their tents (20:26). In their hunger the wicked have, after all, left no *śārîḏ* (20:21). Even though these verses in Job involve linguistic problems and can be interpreted in various ways, they do mutually support one another in clearly demonstrating that *śārîḏ* is to be understood as "remnant, survivors" while completely excluding the meaning "those who have escaped." Hence Isa. 1:9 is also not to be understood as a reference to refugees who were able to find refuge in Jerusalem, but rather to the inhabitants of the city who were spared.

The classical translations have always understood the word thus (LXX, see below; Vg. *relictus* and similar translations), and Post-Biblical Hebrew commensurately coined the denominated vb. *śrd* piel, "leave behind, leave over."[3] Here the word becomes delimited within its specialized semantic field. In contrast to *pālîṭ,* the central point for the term *śārîḏ* is found not in the element of escape from catastrophe, but in the element of survival. The frequently recurring merism *śārîḏ ûpālîṭ* (Josh. 8:22; Jer. 42:17) or *pālîṭ weśārîḏ* (Jer. 44:14; Lam. 2:22) encompasses thus the entirety of those who have survived a catastrophe either by being spared at the site of the catastrophe itself or who saved themselves by having fled. The term *śārîḏ* differs from *pelēṭâ, še'ār, še'ērîṯ* (Gen. 32:9[Eng. 8]; 45:7; Isa. 4:2; 37:31-32) in that it is not really associated with the notion of a new beginning constituted through a remnant, whence also the word frequently appears in negative statements of the sort "there was no remnant."[4] Hebrew Sirach seems to speak of a *śārîḏ* (Sir. 40:6) who flees a persecutor. It is highly unlikely that this verse intends a tautology in the sense "a person who has fled flees," but rather refers to a survivor who takes flight.

3. *LXX.* The most frequent LXX renderings of the Hebrew word derive from the verbal stem *(dia-)sṓzein,* "be unscathed, saved" (Nu. 24:19; Josh. 10:20,28,30, etc.; so also later Greek translators) and are of particular importance in that the frequently parallel synonym *pālîṭ* is usually rendered with *(dia-)pheúgein,* "escape, get away" (Josh. 8:22; 2 K. 9:15; etc.). These different translations remain in effect even when the two words are used as synonymous syntagmas (Josh. 8:22; Lam. 2:22). This pleonastic association, however, occurs in the Hebrew text but not in the Greek text (Jer. 42[49]:17) or, in reverse fashion, only in the LXX and not in the MT (Josh. 10:28,30). Quite independent of any text-critical decisions in individual cases, one can discern the linguistically and historically noteworthy tendency to use the redundant idiom.

Rarely used Greek renderings such as *kataleípein* (Lam. 2:22), *hypoleípein* (Job

---

3. Jastrow, 1628; Bab. *Sanh.* 92a explains *śārîḏ* in Job 20:26 as "leftover *(šyyr)* food."
4. See II.1 below.

20:21), and *perieínai* (27:15) similarly mean "be, remain left over." The term *zōgr(e)ía* (Nu. 21:35; Dt. 2:34) refers to those who were captured alive, i.e., to those who "survived, were spared." Only in a text where the hated kin, the Edomites, deliver the Judaic *śᵉrîḏîm* (pl.!) over to the Babylonians does the LXX refer to "those who flee" (Ob. 14: *pheúgontes*). One rarely occurring rendering (Dt. 3:3; Isa. 1:9) equates *śārîḏ* with "descendants," *spérma.*[5]

II. "Remnant."

1. *Annihilation.* The idiomatic reference to the *śārîḏ* who is not to be "left over" or was not left alive is found especially in accounts of military campaigns, and particularly with those associated with the land conquest. Here the authors understand it as in keeping with Yahweh's specific instructions or at least with his will that no remnant of the enemy be spared in the wars with Og, king of Bashan (Nu. 21:35; Dt. 3:3), and Sihon, king of the Amorites (Dt. 2:34), or in the conquest of Ai (Josh. 8:22), Gezer (10:33), and the northern half of the country (11:8). The verbal form *wᵉhiš'îr,* "and left over/remaining," only seemingly refers to a specific person, e.g., to Joshua in Josh. 11:8. This expression represents a stereotypical formula with an indefinite subject in the sense of "one left over/remaining." The LXX reads a passive form here, *hiššā'ēr,* "was spared."

One remark resembling a gloss in the account of the victory over the southern Canaanite city alliance reads: "*śᵉrîḏîm śārᵉḏû* of them [and they] had entered into the fortified towns" (Josh. 10:20). The paronomastic syntagma in Hebrew probably also refers to the remnant of survivors rather than "the fugitives fled."[6] This term occurs in a linguistically and textually difficult verse in the final Balaam oracle (Nu. 24:19; cited in the only Qumran witness in 1QM 11:7); whatever the case may be here, it is the position of power acquired by Israel that enables them to destroy the "*śārîḏ* from the city," i.e., rout and destroy the rest of the enemy from the cities (or to annihilate what remained of their cities). In the oracle against the Philistines, the prophet announces that their affliction by the enemy from the north will destroy "every helpful *śārîḏ*" who might come to help Tyre and Sidon (Jer. 47:4). A similar oracle is directed against the Judeans. There will be none who survive *(śārîḏ)* and none who escape *(pālîṭ)* among those who after the loss of their own state seek refuge in Egypt (Jer. 42:17; 44:14). One of the passages lamenting this grievous misfortune that befell Judah in 587 B.C.E. ends with the cry of woe: "on the day of the anger of Yahweh there was neither refugee *(pālîṭ)* nor survivor *(śārîḏ)*" (Lam. 2:22). After this catastrophe, the political adversary Edom had either annihilated the Judean refugees or delivered the survivors *(śᵉrîḏîm)* over to the Babylonian troops (Ob. 14).

When the book of Job speaks of a *śārîḏ* (Job 18:19; 20:26), it refers not to the remnant of a vanquished group of people, but to what remains behind after an individual person dies, i.e., to the person's descendants. Memory of the wicked fades; no name re-

---

5. See Hasel, 314-15.
6. S. Holmes, *Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (Cambridge, 1914), 51.

mains behind, since they have neither offspring nor *śārîḏ* (18:17-19). A fire consumes the *śārîḏ* in his tent (20:26). The description of the greed of the wicked (20:15-21) says that though they devour everything, they must spit it out again; nothing remains *(śārîḏ)* from their gluttony (v. 21).

2. *Rescue.* One idea repeatedly emphasized in the OT is that a germ of hope for a blessed future inheres in the survival of a remnant of a group.[7] Rare passages also associate this idea with the word *śārîḏ*. The syntagma mentioned earlier, *śārîḏ 'ōzēr,* "helpful remnant" (Jer. 47:4), attests this positive connotation. In the Song of Deborah, too, the pitiful remnant of the people ultimately becomes mighty (Jgs. 5:13). Because Yahweh allowed a remnant, Zion, to survive in Judah after its decimation by the Assyrians, the land will not meet the same end as did Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa. 1:9). Israel, the people who survived the sword *(śᵉrîḏê ḥereḇ),* found Yahweh's grace in the wilderness (Jer. 31:2). The oracle of glorious redemption promising rescue *(pᵉlēṭâ)* to Zion and Jerusalem at the final judgment says that "among the survivors *(śᵉrîḏîm)* shall be those whom Yahweh calls" (Joel 3:5[2:32]).[8]

Kedar-Kopfstein

---

7. → פלט *pālaṭ,* XI, 362-65; → שׁאר *šā'ar.*
8. Cf. E. Thurre, *Dieu et son peuple selon le livre de Joël* (Fribourg, 1975), 108.

שָׂרַף *śārap;* שָׂרָף *śārāp;* שְׂרֵפָה *śᵉrēpâ;* מִשְׂרָפוֹת *miśrāpôṯ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. The Verb *śrp:* 1. Daily Life; 2. War; 3. Capital Punishment; 4. The Sacrificial Cult; 5. Burning Foreign Cultic Objects; 6. The Term *śrp* in the Molech Cult. III. The Seraphim. IV. Substantival Derivatives. V. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran and the Later Period.

śārap. E. Aurelius, *Der Fürbitter Israels. CBOT* 27 (1988); C. T. Begg, *The Destruction of the Calf (Exod 32,20/Deut 9,21). BETL* 68 (1985), 208-51; C. Daxelmüller and M.-L. Thomsen, "Bildzauber im alten Mesopotamien," *Anthropos* 77 (1982) 27-64; C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot. BBB* 62 (²1987); M. Görg, "Die Funktion der Serafen bei Jesaja," *BN* 5 (1978) 28-39; G. C. Heider, *The Cult of Molek. JSOTSup* 43 (1985); H.-D. Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen. ATANT* 66 (1980); K. R. Joines, "Winged Serpents in Isaiah's Inaugural Vision," *JBL* 86 (1967) 410-15; idem, *Serpent Symbolism in the OT* (Haddonfield, 1974), esp. 42-60; O. Keel, *Visionen und Siegelkunst. SBS* 84/85 (1977); K. Koch, "Aschera als Himmelskönigin in Jerusalem," *UF* 20 (1988) 97-120; S. E. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures. AOAT* 204 (1980); U. Rüterswörden, "Beiträge zur Vernichtungssymbolik," *BN* 2 (1977) 16-22; J. de Savignac, "Les 'Seraphim,'" *VT* 22 (1972) 320-25; H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit. FRLANT* 129 (1982); W. A. Ward, "The Four-Winged Serpent on Hebrew Seals," *RSO* 43 (1968) 135-43.

I. Etymology. The vb. *śrp* is widely attested in the Semitic languages, including Middle Hebrew, "burn completely, kindle a fire" (in connection with interment), then also the "seraph"; Ugar. *šrp,* "burn completely" (in contrast to the OT, also a term associated with sacrifice);[1] Akk. *šarāpu,* "burn (up)," often used analogously to the Hebrew word;[2] New South Arabic in a specialized context as *śrf,* "kindle a fire";[3] Egyptian Aram.,[4] Jewish Aram., Mand. *srp,* "burn";[5] Egyp. *śrf,* "warm, be warm."[6]

II. The Verb *śrp*.

1. *Daily Life.* The 117 occurrences of the verb in the OT often exhibit a polemical connotation in that trans. *śrp* describes an act of annihilation carried out with regard to people and objects that in their own turn are characterized by such features as hostility, ritual taboo, or particular abominableness. To that extent, it differs from the vb. → בער *b'r,*[7] which in the qal generally refers intransitively to the oxidation process caused by fire. The positive connotations of fire, for example, as the dispenser of warmth and light, or purification, though also the metaphorical use of the glowing fire,[8] recede in the use of *śrp.*

Passages using *śrp* to refer (without polemic) to "burning" include Gen. 11:3,[9] which describes the burning of bricks. This is the only passage using the verb to write about a constructive rather than a destructive act.[10]

Poetic comparisons referencing fire include 2 S. 23:7; Ps. 80:17(16); Prov. 6:27; Isa. 47:14, though the reference is always to natural phenomena. At least the imagery itself is free from polemics regarding the incinerated objects. The incineration of the dead at funerals (2 Ch. 16:14; Jer. 34:5; cf. 2 Ch. 21:19) is not colored by the polemical idea of annihilation.[11]

---

1. *UT,* no. 2489; *WUS,* no. 2690; cf. B. Janowski, "Erwägungen zur Vorgeschichte des israelitischen *šᵉlamîm*-Opfers," *UF* 12 (1980) 231-59.
2. *AHw,* III, 1185.
3. T. M. Johnstone, *Jibbāli Lexicon* (Oxford, 1981), 254; cf. also W. W. Müller, in Christian Robin, ed., *Mélanges linguistiques. FS Maxime Rodinson. GLECSSup* 12 (1985), 276.
4. *DNSI,* II, 1194.
5. *MdD,* 338.
6. *WbÄS,* IV, 195.
7. *HAL,* I, 145-46; *GesB*18, 164-65.
8. → אשׁ *'ēš ('ēsh),* I, 423-24, 426-27.
9. Judged as ancient if one trusts the more recent documentary hypothesis; or traditionally viewed as J — so C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. trans. 1984), 540; O. H. Steck, "Genesis 12,1-3 und die Urgeschichte des Jahwisten," *Wahrnehmungen Gottes im AT. ThB* 70 (1982), 117-48; or part of a pre-Yahwist etiology according to P. Weimar, *Untersuchungen zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Pentateuch. BZAW* 146 (1977), 158, 160; a different position is taken by F. Crüsemann, "Die Eigenständigkeit der Urgeschichte," *Die Botschaft und die Boten. FS H. W. Wolff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981), 11-29.
10. C. Uehlinger, *Weltreich und "eine Rede": Eine neue Deutung der sogenannten Turmbauerzählung (Gen 11,1-9). OBO* 101 (1990), 360-72; concerning the burning of bricks, cf. P. Panitscheck, *Grazer Morgenländische Studien* 2 (1987) 255-77.
11. W. Zwickel, "Über das angebliche Verbrennen von Räucherwerk bei der Bestattung des Königs," *ZAW* 101 (1989) 266-77.

2. *War.* Passages frequently describe how during a war the cities of the enemy are burned to the ground (Nu. 31:10; Jgs. 18:27; 1 S. 30:1,3,14; 1 K. 9:16; Isa. 1:7; cf. also the oracles of disaster in Jer. 21:10; 32:29; 34:2,22; 37:8,10; 38:17-18,23 — all of which are prose pieces — according to which the Babylonians will burn Jerusalem to the ground). Annihilation of this sort involves houses, palaces, and citadels (Jgs. 9:52; 2 K. 25:9; Jer. 39:8; 51:32; 52:13; Ezk. 16:41; 23:47).

The incineration of enemy cities is a frequent occurrence in the ancient Near East in connection with environmental destruction consciously inflicted as part of military campaigns.[12] Such acts of destruction are a common topos on royal Assyrian inscriptions, for example, in those of Sennacherib: "I destroyed the city and (its) houses, from the foundations to the roofs, I laid them waste, I burned them up with fire . . . I extinguished (them) with (floods of) water and turned them into a meadow so that in the future no one will remember either the location of the city or (of its) temples and gods."[13]

The burning of cities in connection with *ḥērem* actions is described in Josh. 6:24 (Jericho); 8:28 (Ai); 11:11 (Hazor). These actions contradict the promise (Dt. 6:10) and rule of Deuteronomy (20:10-18) that although human life might in given instances be extinguished in the cities, other immoveable objects or goods are to be spared. In this case what was actually a highly irregular incineration of Jericho, Ai, and Hazor was probably already a fixed element of tradition.[14]

Dt. 13:13-19(12-18) prescribes the incineration of an Israelite city that has fallen away from Yahweh, including all of the spoils in it. Verse 15(14) suggests that this action is part of a *ḥērem;* according to R. P. Merendino,[15] this passage is essentially pre-Dtr (addenda in v. 14[13]; vv. 17-18[16-17] are late). The city's transgression is described as *tôʿēḇâ* (v. 15[14]). The *ḥērem* action and the incineration of the place are prompted by the particularly abominable character of the transgression.

3. *Capital Punishment.* This same view is certainly present in passages recounting how people are burned to death as punishment. Such is the case in the burning of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10:6 P^G), who had presented "unholy fire," *ʾēš zārâ* (v. 1; cf. *BHS*); this punishment is carried out by Yahweh himself. The addendum in Nu. 17:1-5(16:36-40) interprets Korah's actions in 16:1-35 as a cultic transgression punishable by death by fire (16:35; 17:4[16:39]).[16] Achan is burned to death because of the *nᵉḇālâ* he has committed and for having transgressed the covenant (a Dtr theme;[17] Josh. 7:15,25). The burning of Samson's wife and her father's house by the Philistines is por-

---

12. S. Hutter-Braunsar, *Grazer Morgenländische Studien* 2 (1987) 201-18; E. Bleibtreu, ibid., 219-33.

13. See D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (Chicago, 1927 = London 1989), II, §341.

14. → V, 196-97.

15. *Das deuteronomische Gesetz. BBB* 31 (1969), 69-82.

16. On the textual strata see M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 120-31.

17. → IX, 169.

trayed as extortion and brutal retaliation (Jgs. 14:15; 15:6). Lev. 20:14 sanctions death by burning for a man who marries a woman and her mother, a transgression described as *zimmâ,* "depravity." The daughter of a priest who has turned to prostitution meets the same fate (Lev. 21:9), since by doing so she defiles her father. Although in this case the punishment is so severe because this girl participates in her father's holiness,[18] death by burning seems to have been the punishment for prostitution in other instances as well (e.g., Gen. 38:24). Dt. 22:22ff. stipulates capital punishment or stoning for the transgression of adultery. Death by burning denies the transgressor proper burial; remaining unburied is part of what makes death by burning even more severe.[19] On the other hand, burning the bones of a dead person is viewed as a transgression (Am. 2:1).[20] The burning of human remains on an altar defiles the altar (1 K. 13:2; 2 K. 23:16,20; cf. 2 Ch. 34:5).

Capital punishment by burning is attested outside Israel as well.[21] In CH the transgressions include a visit to a wineshop by a priestess (§110) and incest (§157). As in the OT, punishment is directed against priestly transgressions and sexual offenses. According to Herodotus, adultery was occasionally punished by death in Egypt as well.[22]

4. *The Sacrificial Cult.* Ugaritic witnesses attest *šrp* as a burnt offering.[23] By contrast, Heb. *śrp* is not a sacrificial term in the OT.[24] The verb refers to the annihilation of what is left over of the sacrificial meal after the sacrifice *(hannôṯār).* The Passover regulation in Ex. 12:10 thus stipulates that one burn whatever remains on the morning after the Passover meal.[25] According to Lev. 8:32, whatever is left over from the sacrificial meal of Aaron and his sons is to be burned immediately (cf. Ex. 29:34). By contrast, Lev. 7:16-17 and 19:6 allow consumption on the next day, with the remainder not being burned until the third day. Such regulations are justified by reference to the holiness *(qōḏeš)* of the sacrificial material (Ex. 29:34).[26] The remainder is qualified in Lev. 7:17-18 and 19:6-7 as → פגול *piggûl,* and 19:6-7 fixes capital punishment for those who eat it after the second day. Unclean meat is also to be burned (7:19).

The flesh, skin, and dung of sacrificial animals are to be burned immediately after the sin offering *(ḥaṭṭā'â,* Ex. 29:14; Lev. 4:11-12,21; 8:17; 9:11; 16:27-28; Ezk. 43:21; cf. Lev. 6:23[30]; 10:16). The slaughter of the red heifer in Nu. 19:5 and 8 is not part of a sacrificial action;[27] and its qualification as purification rite in v. 9 is sec-

---

18. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 289.
19. Cf. Hoffmann, 184; concerning 1 S. 31:12, → II, 436.
20. See R. Degen, "Weitere Inschriften aus Hatra (Nr 281-335)," *NESE* 3 (1978), 92-93.
21. E.g., CH §§110, 157; cf. also §25.
22. Herodotus 2.111; concerning capital punishment through burning, cf. E. Hornung, *Altägyptische Höllenvorstellungen. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Leipzig.* Phil.-hist. Kl. 59/3 (1968), 27.
23. B. Janowski, *UF* 12 (1980) 246.
24. R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967), 223.
25. → XII, 10, 17-19.
26. → XII, 532-34.
27. Noth, *Numbers,* 140.

ondary.[28] According to Lev. 13:47ff., one of the priest's tasks is to examine textiles and leather to determine the presence of "leprous disease," probably an attack of mold; the infected material is to be burned (vv. 52,55,57).

5. *Burning Foreign Cultic Objects.* The destruction of cultic objects associated with foreign gods is described by the vb. *śrp.*[29] Here it is not an issue whether the objects can genuinely be burned in the first place. Koch[30] thinks the account of the Josianic reform refers to an Asherah image made of a wood core overlaid with metal; earlier exegetes since Johann David Michaelis (1717-91) have suspected that something similar applies to the golden calf in Exod. 32.[31]

Since Loewenstamm, however, the assumption has been that these texts bring to expression a symbolism of extermination concerned only with the complete destruction of the cultic objects.[32] In this sense the various methods of such destruction do concur with one another and are also attested elsewhere in the ancient Near East in connection with mythology and magic. Moreover, the receding practicality of some of these measures shows that these passages actually represent ivory-tower musings.[33] The relevant passages (Ex. 32:20; Dt. 7:5,25; 9:21; 12:3; 1 K. 15:13 par. 2 Ch. 15:16; 2 K. 10:26; 23:4,6,11,15,16; 1 Ch. 14:12) date at least in part to the Deuteronomist at the earliest. To the extent that the Pentateuch passages are indeed Dtr, they might conceivably derive from the stereotypical cultic-historical view of those circles. The Pentateuch articulates the regulations that were then followed in Israel with the exception of Hezekiah and Josiah. This view is also supported by the Dtr origin of Ex. 23:24[34] and 34:13,[35] passages stipulating the destruction of cultic objects (without *śrp*). Viewed historically, the explicit regulations concerning such destruction in Deuteronomy would then not represent the initiators of the Josianic reform, or at most perhaps the regulation in Dt. 16:21,[36] though even this passage prohibits the *erection* of Asherahs and massebahs rather than ordering their *burning.*

The parallel adduced by Loewenstamm regarding the destruction of the golden calf in Ex. 32 reads: "She ['Anat] seized Motu, the son of Ilu. With a knife she split him *(tbq'nn),* with a sieve she scattered him *(tdrynn),* with fire she burnt him *(tšrpnn),* with

---

28. Concerning literary-critical issues, cf. R. Rendtorff, *Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift. Eine gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. FRLANT* 62 (^{2}1963), 64-65; cf. also J. L. Blau, "Red Heifer: A Biblical Purification Rite in Rabbinic Literature," *Numen* 14 (1967) 70-78.

29. Cf. the enumeration of verbs associated with such cultic elimination in Hoffmann, 342-48, esp. 345-46.

30. Koch, 106.

31. On the history of scholarship on this issue see Loewenstamm, 236-45.

32. Ibid., 160-65, 236-45, 426-32, 503-16. See also Rüterswörden; Begg.

33. Hoffmann, 312, 346.

34. F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen. OBO* 45 (1982), 269.

35. G. Schmitt, *Du sollst keinen Frieden schliessen mit den Bewohnern des Landes. BWANT* 91 (1970), 27; Dohmen, 257 n. 63.

36. See in this regard Dohmen, 266ff.

a mill she ground him *(ṭṭḥnn)*, in the field she sowed him *(tdrʿnn)*. The birds did eat his flesh, the fowl did consume his limbs."[37] The origin from the same Northwest Semitic linguistic sphere tempts one to engage in comparisons extending even to the level of word choice; direct influence of Ugaritic texts on Dtr notions and linguistic clichés, however, is improbable, though such symbolism of destruction does recur in later ancient Near Eastern texts.[38] The *adê* oath of Esarhaddon (§36) adds threats of punishment to the destruction of the contractual document by the three elements of fire, water, and earth: "If you remove it [this tablet of the *adê* oath], consign it to fire, throw it into water, bury it in dust, or by some trick destroy, annihilate, or turn it face down. . . ."[39] The sealing with the Assyrian seal in the preceding paragraph (§35) shows that the tablet itself was conceived as being deified.[40] Here too the issue is the destruction of an object belonging to the divine sphere. Such views recur frequently in the Kudurru inscriptions and at the end of royal Assyrian inscriptions.[41] According to C. Levin, the burning of the scroll in Jer. 36 is a symbolic act.[42]

6. *The Term śrp in the Molech Cult.* According to Dt. 12:31; 2 K. 17:31; Jer. 7:31; 19:5, the Molech cult includes the burning *(śrp)* of children. The actual technical term is *ʿbr* hiphil, which some believe describes a kind of magic consecration, others a sacrifice.[43] The Dtr passages try to concretize the expression *ʿbr* hiphil + *bāʾēš* by replacing it with "burn up."[44] In the meantime, *śrp* is not a sacrificial term, but rather circumscribes an act of destruction. The polemicizing Dtr word choice insinuates that the burning of children has no effect.

III. The Seraphim. Viewed from the perspective of Hebrew forms, the term *śārāp̄* is a *qaṭal* construction from *śrp*.[45] Since *śrp* is a transitive verb, the *śārāp̄* refers to an entity that singes something. Keel understands the seraph as a Uraeus serpent and suggests that the name *śārāp̄* might derive from the serpent's ability to burn its victims with its poison.[46]

By contrast, Görg, following an idea suggested by W. M. Müller,[47] derives the sera-

---

37. *KTU* 1.6, II, 30-36; J. C. de Moor, "An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit," *Nisaba* 16 (1987) 88-90, with a different interpretation than Loewenstamm; cf. *KTU* 1.6, V, 9-19; *ANET*, 140b, ll. 30-36.

38. Rüterswörden; Begg; Daxelmüller and Thomsen.

39. K. Watanabe, *Die adê-Vereidigung anlässlich der Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons. Baghdader Mitteilungen* Beiheft 3 (1986) 163; *ANET*, 538, §36.

40. Watanabe, 24.

41. Ibid., 190.

42. *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt. FRLANT* 137 (1985), 148.

43. → X, 417-18; → VIII, 385-88; on *mōleḵ* see Heider.

44. Spieckermann, 101-4.

45. *BLe*, §61 m″-o″.

46. Keel, 74; cf. 71.

47. *GesB*, 794.

phim from Egyp. *sfr,* with the late constructions *sfrr* and Demotic *srrf.* The metathesis may have been prompted by the influence of the term *srf,* "warmth, heat, fever," already attested in Middle Egyptian, a word suggesting an Egyptian-Semitic root relationship with *śrp.* Although the griffin designated by *sfr/srf* is indeed attested as a winged desert animal[48] portrayed with great variety, any identity with the cobra or Uraeus serpent back to which Keel traces the seraphim is excluded. "The suspicion thus arises that in the Palestinian sphere, the mythical potency of the Egyptian *srf* was indeed picked up and associated with the cobra figure but without any concurrence of imagery. On the basis of its phonetic and semantic equivalence with Egyptian *srf,* the Semitic root *ŚRP* became the formal link between the conception of the Egyptian 'griffin' and the biblical 'seraph.'"[49] This thesis has not gone unchallenged.[50]

The noun *śārāp* occurs in Nu. 21:6,8; Dt. 8:15; Isa. 6:2,6; 14:29; 30:6. Interpreters usually combine the information from all these occurrences and imagine the seraphim in Isa. 6 to be winged serpents (though a different view is taken, e.g., by the LXX, which has *seraphin* only in Isa. 6).[51] This understanding, argumentatively justified and explicated with pictorial materials by Keel, has become the consensus.

On this view the seraphim are to be identified with the originally Egyptian Uraeus serpents. "The Uraeus serpent appears in Egypt above all as a protective deity. It kills the enemies of the gods and of the king by spitting fire (its poison)."[52] The Uraeus serpents are attested on Palestinian seals, with one striking group from the 8th century portraying four-winged serpents.[53] Keel's main argument refers to the seraphim's position above Yahweh (Isa. 6:2), which would be inconceivable if the seraphim had human shapes.[54] Beings with human shape above a god or king are not attested iconographically and doubtless contradicted etiquette. "The problem is solved if we imagine winged Uraeus serpents spreading their wings protectively over a god or king or hovering above him. The same verse (v. 2) containing the *'mdym* ('stood') clearly says that they hover. On seals and other miniatures, one sees, as already shown, a frieze of Uraeus figures protecting a god's chapel, two Uraeus figures flanking a sacred object or a god, a winged Uraeus hovering protectively above (or behind) something, or simply four-winged Uraeus figures. Isaiah is describing the seraphim as they were familiar to his contemporaries from the Uraeus reliefs or from pictorial representations: in a threatening upright posture or hovering protectively over the god or king they are supposed to protect."[55]

---

48. Concerning the iconography, see A. M. Bisi, *Il grifone: storia di un motivo iconografico nell'antico Oriente mediterraneo. SS* 13 (1965).

49. Görg, 32-33.

50. See S. Schroer, *In Israel gab es Bilder. OBO* 74 (1987), 105, note 163.

51. So Joines, *JBL* 86 (1967) 410-11; Keel, 79; *BDB,* 977, classifies the occurrences in Isa. 6 under a homonym; according to H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), in loc., they had a human form; cf. R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–12. NEB* 17 (1986), 48.

52. Keel, 84.

53. Ibid., 106-10.

54. Ibid., 75.

55. Ibid., 111-12.

Keel's plausible interpretation notwithstanding, one must keep open the possibility of understanding the seraphim as having a human form. The point of departure can be a temporal examination of the passages. Although Keel[56] suggests that the passages from Isaiah stem from the prophet himself, this is not so certain for Isa. 14:28-32.[57] In any event, those who do assume Isaianic authorship should not press this imagery such that the *śārāp* must be imagined as a serpent ("for from the root of the snake will come forth an adder, and its fruit will be a flying *śārāp*," v. 29b). This metaphor draws from and mixes the world of plants (root) and animals. "One ought not try to press this imagery to make every detail fit logically: a seraph is certainly not a **צפע** (viper)."[58] The imagery of "root" and "fruit" (in contrast, e.g., to *zera'* or the sequence *nēṣer-šōreš* as in Isa. 11:1; Dnl. 11:7) can be used because the issue is not one of equivalent species.

Used negatively, this metaphorical reference to "root" and "fruit" serves to announce to a collective entity its complete annihilation (Ezk. 17:9; Hos. 9:16; Am. 2:9; cf. Mal. 3:19), comparable to Eng. "roots and all." Such annihilation is total because, following the metaphor of the tree, the path to regermination is destroyed. There will be no more descendants. Used positively, reference to the "root" and "fruit" can circumscribe the revivification of a people (2 K. 19:30 par. Isa. 37:31; cf. Isa. 27:6ff. and Jer. 12:2 with the vb. *šrš*).[59] In such cases the sequence "root-fruit" metaphorically circumscribes the totality of a phenomenon (in the sense of "above-below" in 2 K. 19:30 par. Isa. 37:31; Am. 2:9; cf. Job 18:16).[60] The metaphor in Isa. 14:29 is trying to say that the adversary of the Philistines still has its full power and as a matter of fact has not been broken. Frightening things will still come from it. The reversal of the sequence to "fruit-root" in Am. 2:9 shows that the reference to *šōreš* and *p^e rî* in and of itself does not necessarily involve the notion of descent.

This view also emerges from an examination of the contemporary circumstances reflected in Isa. 14:28-29.[61] H. Donner believes that the oracle is based on the circumstances surrounding the change of sovereigns from Shalmaneser V to Sargon II.[62] The origin of Sargon II is obscure; he was a usurper, perhaps a son of Tiglath-pileser III, but not of Shalmaneser V. This genealogical discontinuity also emerges in K. Marti's late dating: Artaxerxes (III) Ochos-Alexander the Great.[63] One text-critical detail deserves attention. The Vg. reads *śrp* as a verb or as a participle: "et semen eius absorbens volucrem," after Middle Heb. *śrp,* "slurp, suck." The variant *śārap* in the Kennicott mss. also presupposes a verb.[64]

---

56. Ibid., 71-72.
57. R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–39. EdF* 200 (1983), 82-83.
58. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. trans. 1997), 96.
59. See in this regard P. J. Becker, "Wurzel und Wurzelspross," *BZ* 20 (1976) 22-44.
60. See also *KAI* 14.11-12.
61. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 52-53, is reserved on this issue.
62. H. Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern. SVT* 11 (1964), 110-13.
63. K. Marti, *Das Buch Jesaia. KHC* X (1900), 132; similarly already in the comm. of Johannes Cocceius (1603-69).
64. Kennicott, 30, 96; after the Hebrew Univ. Bible.

Isa. 30:6 says only that the seraphim fly; it says nothing about their form. At least according to the book of Isaiah, the seraphim need not have had the form of a serpent. Things stand differently, however, with Dt. 8:15, where *śārāp* stands in apposition to *nāḥāš*. The text describes a kind of serpent, not a winged creature as in the book of Isaiah. Not only do the two passages differ with regard to form, but they also differ as far as dating is concerned if one traces the Isaianic passages back to the prophet himself (cf. the controversial ascriptions, except for Isa. 30:6, in Wildberger and Kaiser). Verse 15 belongs to the earliest stage of Dt. 8, with some scholars viewing it as early postexilic,[65] though even a preexilic dating would involve a temporal distance between the two.

This distance is also clear in the text of Nu. 21:4-9,[66] which portrays the setting up of the healing bronze serpent and derives from R^{P}.[67] "Nu. 21:4-9 is not legitimizing the role of the serpent image in Jerusalem with the help of certain popular fantasies about the wilderness period, but is explaining the onerous but apparently ineluctable derivation of the image from Moses himself in 2 K. 18:4 by adducing the salvific proclamation in Dt. 8:15. . . . The understanding of Moses as intercessor connects the two passages."[68]

Joines's suggestion that "the earliest and the latest OT usages of *saraph* date probably in the same one-hundred-year time span" can hardly be maintained.[69] Rather, the temporal distance is joined by one related to content as well. The Pentateuch's use of *śārāp* as an attribute to *nāḥāš* suggests understanding *śārāp* as an adjective[70] (Sam. reads in Nu. 21:8; Dt. 8:15; certain Sam. mss. in Nu. 21:6 read *śrwp,* which is probably construed as a passive participle of the vb. *śrp;*[71] cf. also LXX), in which case Nu. 21:8 would contain an ellipsis; the adjective would be used as a substantive.[72] The *nāḥāš śārāp* is a serpent (cf. also the PN *śārāp;* see below); nothing is said about wings.

By contrast, in the book of Isaiah *śārāp* is a substantive, in Isa. 6 without, and in Isa. 14 and 30 with, an attribute. The seraphim are winged; the serpent form is not certain.[73] These wings point to the divine-demonic character of the seraphim (cf. Keel's illustration of the four-winged gods and genies;[74] Keel follows the OT and ancient Near Eastern background in viewing the seraphim on the whole as a zoological species[75]). The seraphim in Isa. 6 have faces, hands, and feet (or gender), features supporting the idea

---

65. Aurelius, 22-23, 39.

66. → IX, 366-67, 378-80.

67. Cf. H. Maneschg, *Die Erzählung von der ehernen Schlange (Num 21,4-9) in der Auslegung der frühen jüdischen Literatur. EHS* 23/157 (1981), 97-98; Aurelius, 152, dates it later; Schroer, *In Israel,* 105-11, dates it earlier.

68. Aurelius, 151.

69. *JBL* 86 (1967).

70. See Schroer, *In Israel,* 105-6.

71. See R. Macuch, *Grammatik des samaritanischen Hebräisch* (Berlin, 1969), §66 dβ.

72. See Keel, 71 n. 101.

73. See P. Welten, *BRL*², 226-27; *HAL,* III, 1360-61.

74. Keel, 194-216.

75. Ibid., 72-73, with n. 106.

of the human form. Keel adduces noteworthy arguments against this view.[76] One problem involves the six wings, noted by Keel: "I accept Isaiah's six-winged Uraeus figures even if they are not attested anywhere in art."[77] He believes the description with six wings constitutes a "slight intensification" of the Uraeus figures with four wings.[78]

A six-winged genie with human form has long been familiar from Tell Halaf, and although Keel dismisses this figure as a unique phenomenon,[79] such a view is relativized by the following examples:

1. Tell Halaf: relief; figure with three pairs of wings; 9th century[80]
2. Deve Hüyük: seal; figure with three pairs of wings; 7th-5th centuries[81]

Some monuments have preserved rudimentary illustrations with six wings, including nonhuman-headed mixed beings:

3. Sakçagözü: relief; bird-headed genie with two pairs of wings, between each of them a conical element which can be interpreted as a rudimentary pair of wings[82]
4. Olympia: relief stand; four fragments of a large stand with winged demons striding to the right; 8th/7th century;[83] Herrmann believes the triangular shape between the wings represents a rudimentary wing illustration[84]
5. Cyprus: scarab; figure with six wings, perhaps an illustration of the divine messenger Iris[85]

The six-winged figure is reliably attested in nos. 1 and 2; the remaining examples represent either misunderstandings or further developments. This image derives from the northern Syrian/Anatolian sphere and extends temporally down to the 7th-5th centuries.

If the seraphim need not be Uraeus serpent figures, then Wildberger's classification of the seraphim in Isa. 6 as the heavenly hosts *(ṣᵉḇā' haššāmayim),* especially through the comparison with 1 K. 22:19-21, still seems at least worthy of consideration.[86] In any event these seraphim, one of whom performs an atonement act on Isaiah according to

---

76. Ibid., 75-79; cf. Ward, 142 n. 5; C. Herrmann, "Fünf phönizische Formen für ägyptische Fayencen," *ZDPV* 105 (1989) 34-38.

77. Keel, 193 n. 157.

78. Ibid., 113.

79. Ibid., 75.

80. W. Orthmann, *Untersuchungen zur späthethitischen Kunst. Saarbrücker Beiträge zur Altertumskunde* 8 (1971), 316, pl. 10e; Keel, 77, ill. 28.

81. P. R. S. Moorey, *Cemeteries of the First Millennium B.C. at Deve Hüyük. BAR International Series* 87 (Oxford, 1980), 114, ill. 474.

82. Orthmann, *Untersuchungen,* 320-21; H.-V. Herrmann, *Die Kessel der orientalisierenden Zeit. Olympische Forschungen* 6 (1966) 168, 172.

83. Herrmann, *Kessel,* 161ff.

84. Ibid., 162, 167-68.

85. J. Boardman, *Archaic Greek Gems* (London, 1968), no. 40.

86. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 252-53, 264-65; cf. O. H. Steck, "Genesis 12,1-3," 149-70; a different view is taken by Keel, 48-49.

Isa. 6:7, are closely associated with Yahweh: "The quaking and smoke accompanying the calling of the seraphim, phenomena otherwise reserved for Yahweh's theophanies, show that despite their subordination to Yahweh (v. 2), they are 'intimately associated with Yahweh's world.' Their soteriological function in Isa. 6:6-7 is also to be viewed in this light. . . . Divorced from the mediating function of a priest, this atonement process (in this sense, too, removed from the 'sphere of cultic practices') is carried out by one of those beings whose association with Yahweh's world simultaneously represents the distance separating human beings from divine holiness and majesty."[87]

IV. Substantival Derivatives. 1 Ch. 4:22 attests the PN *śārāp*. According to M. Noth and T. Nöldeke, this name derives from the animal name designating a kind of snake.[88] The semantic spectrum of *śᵉrēpâ* concurs with that of the vb. *śrp,* as when Gen. 11:3 describes the burning of bricks, when the expression is used in connection with the burning of the red heifer (Nu. 19:6,17), or when the reference is to fire at interments (2 Ch. 16:14; 21:19). The meaning "place of fire" is attested in Nu. 17:2(16:37); Dt. 29:22(23), and "fire, blaze," in Lev. 10:6; Isa. 9:4(5); 64:10(11); Am. 4:11. Dt. 29:22 says that if the covenant is broken, the land will become a place of burned destruction like Sodom and Gomorrah (cf. Am. 4:11).

In Isa. 33:12 *miśrāpôṯ* refers to the burning of people to lime, and in Jer. 34:5 to the fires accompanying interment. The place name *miśrᵉpôṯ mayim* in Josh. 11:8 and 13:6 is to be identified with Khirbet el-Musheirefeh according to Noth, and with Minet el-Musheirefeh according to E. Höhne.[89]

V. 1. *LXX.* The LXX generally renders the vb. *śrp* as *(kata)kaíein* (76 times), *empipránai, emprḗthein* (25), and *empyrízein* (14), and the substantival constructions *śārāp* as *aspís, thanatoún* (once each) or *óphis* (twice), and *śᵉrēpâ* as *ekphorá* (3 times), *empyrismós, katákauma* (once each), *pýr,* and *pyríkaustos* (2 each), if not translated as verbs.

2. *Qumran and the Later Period.* The term *śrph* is attested in Qumran in 1QM 14:18 and 1QH 3:31, passages referring to the world conflagration. Occurrences of the vb. *śrp* in 11QT (2:7; 16:11,12,13; 26:9; 43:11; 55:9) remain within the framework of the pentateuchal occurrences constituting the basis of 11QT; cf. also 4QOrd 1, II, 17 with Ex. 32:20. The two occurrences 4Q179 1, I, 5 (within a lament) and 4QMᵃ 17:6 are fragments.[90]

Rüterswörden

---

87. B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982), 125, 128-29.

88. *IPN,* 230; T. Nöldeke, *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strasbourg, 1904), 87; additional examples in both.

89. M. Noth, *Das Buch Joshua. HAT* I/7 (1971), 69; E. Höhne, *Palästina* (Göttingen, 1981), 67.

90. Concerning the seraphim in other extracanonical literature, cf. J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The OT Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; Garden City, N.Y., 1983-85), II, index s.v.; P. Schäfer, *Rivalität zwischen Engeln und Menschen: Untersuchungen zur rabbininischen Engelvorstellung. Studia Judaica* 8 (1975), index s.v.; J. Michl, *RAC,* V, 60-97.

שָׁאַב šā'aḇ; מַשְׁאַבִּים maš'abbîm

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT. III. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. Etymology. The term *š'b* occurs 4 times in Ugarit as a feminine participle, including *štk šibt 'n,* "pour out (water), or the one who draws water from the spring";[1] *s't bnpk šibt,* "running in from the well (will/did come) the women drawing (water)";[2] *[']ḫth šib yṣt,* "his sister was drawing water (and) came out."[3] The Hebrew form *š'b* corresponds to Akk. *sâbu(m),* also *sâpu,* "draw (water),"[4] and Arab. *sa'aba,* "constrict the throat, have drunk considerably."[5] In Jewish Aramaic and Middle Hebrew, *š'b* means (1) "draw (water)," (2) "attract, draw in," (3) "receive."[6]

II. OT. The root *š'b* occurs 20 times in the OT, including the verb 19 times in the qal and the noun *maš'abbîm* once. The verb is used exclusively in connection with the drawing of water; the obj. *mayim* is used 11 times and is otherwise to be derived contextually. It is not surprising that an activity as routine as drawing water is mentioned only peripherally or only if special significance attaches to it.[7]

The former is the case in Gen. 24, where *š'b* occurs 8 times. Here one notices that in the narrator's account of the meeting between the servant and Rebekah in vv. 12-20 and in the servant's account to Laban concerning his meeting with Rebekah in vv. 42-46, the vb. *š'b* can alternate with the vbs. *šqh* hiphil and *ml'* piel. The narrator notes initially that the servant arrived at the well outside the city "toward evening, the time when women go out to draw water *(haššō'ᵃḇōṯ)*" (v. 11). In his prayer the servant says, "and the daughters of the townspeople are coming out to draw water" (*liš'ōḇ,* v. 13b), and then continues in v. 14a, "Let the girl *(hanna'ᵃrâ)* to whom I shall say, 'Please offer your jar that I may drink,' and who shall say, 'Drink, and I will water *('ašqeh)* your camels.'" Verse 14a corresponds to vv. 43b-44a, "let the young woman *(hā'almâ)* who comes out to draw *(liš'ōḇ),* to whom I shall say, 'Please give me a little water from your jar to drink,' and who will say to me, 'Drink, and I will draw *('eš'āḇ)* for your camels also." In addition, v. 16b, "she went down to the spring, filled *(wattᵉmallē')* her jar, and came up," corresponds to v. 45aβ, "and she went down to the spring, and drew *(wattiš'āḇ)*"; and v. 19bα, "she said, 'I will draw *('eš'āḇ)* for your camels also,'" corresponds to v. 46aβ, "she said, 'Drink, and I will also water *('ašqeh)* your camels.'" The statement in v. 20bβ, "and she ran again to the well to draw *(liš'ōḇ),*" finds no corre-

1. *KTU* 1.12, II, 59; *WUS,* no. 2563.
2. *KTU* 1.14, III, 9 (= V, 1); correctly as *bnpk* in V, 1 instead of *bnk* in III, 9; *CML*³, 85, 88.
3. *KTU* 1.16, I, 51; cf. *CML*², 96: "*šib* error for *šibt* [or masc. for fem.]."
4. *CAD,* XV, 9-10; *AHw,* II, 1000.
5. Lane, I/4, 1281.
6. *ANH,* 412; Jastrow, 1505.
7. On the (leather) drawing bucket, see *AuS,* V (1937), 189; VI (1939), 270-71, 275.

spondence in the account before Laban, whereas the statement in v. 20b, "and she drew *(wattiš'ab)* for all his camels," acquires in v. 46b the form, "So I drank, and she also watered *(hišqāṯâ)* the camels."

Hence the author places no special emphasis on the process of drawing water. The vb. *š'b* is not found in the well scene in Gen. 29:1-14, where only *šqh* hiphil is used (vv. 2,3,7,8,10). The well scene in Ex. 2:15b-22 uses not *š'b* but rather *dlh:* "They [the daughters of the priest of Midian] came and drew water *(wattiḏlenâ) . . . to water (l^ehašqôṯ)* their father's flock" (v. 16b); "and Moses . . . watered *(wayyašq)* their flock" (v. 17b). The daughters relate this to their father by saying, "he even drew water *(dālōh ḏālâ)* for us and watered *(wayyašq)* the flock" (v. 19b).

In a fourth well scene,[8] 1 S. 9:11-13, one reads: "As they [Saul and his servant] went up the hill to the town, they met some girls coming out to draw water *(liš'ōḇ)*" (v. 11a).

In other passages special emphasis attaches to the act of drawing water. In the oracle against Nineveh (though the city is not mentioned here) in Nah. 3:12-17, the prophet ironically summons the city to prepare for the siege by referring first to its water provisions: "Draw *(ša'^aḇî-lāḵ)* water for the siege *(mê māṣôr),* strengthen your forts" (v. 14a).

While Ruth is gleaning in the field, Boaz says to her, "if you get thirsty, go to the vessels and drink from what the young men have drawn *(yiš'^aḇûn)*" (Ruth 2:9b). Either he is showing her favor in that she does not have to draw the water herself, or he is being especially generous in that he will be buying and paying for the water himself and putting it at Ruth's disposal.[9]

In a reverse fashion David allegedly declines water that has been drawn especially for him and presents it instead to Yahweh (as a libation[10]). According to the short story in 2 S. 23:13-17 par. 1 Ch. 11:15-19, while staying in Adullam David wished to drink water from the well at the gate of Bethlehem, which was occupied by the Philistines (v. 15). "Then the three warriors broke through the camp of the Philistines, drew *(wayyiš'^aḇû)* water from the well . . . and brought it to David. But he would not drink of it; he poured *(wayyassēḵ)* it out to Yahweh" (v. 16 par. 1 Ch. 11:18), saying that it was the blood of the men who went at the risk of their lives to get it (v. 17).

1 S. 7:6 mentions the drawing of water as a cultic act. After recounting that Israel, at Samuel's behest, "put away the Baals and the Astartes," and that Samuel then gathered Israel together at Mizpah (vv. 3-5), the passage continues: "So they [the Israelites] gathered at Mizpah, and drew *(wayyiš'^aḇû)* water and poured *(wayyišp^eḵû)* it out before Yahweh. They fasted that day, and said 'We have sinned against Yahweh.'" The passage probably refers to "an otherwise unknown penitential ceremony."[11]

The counterpart to such a penitential rite is probably attested in the eschatological thanksgiving hymn in Isa. 12:1-6 with its promise: "With joy you will draw *(ûš^e'aḇtem)* water from the wells of salvation" (v. 3).[12] This passage may allude to a symbolic act of

8. Cf. W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6. BK* II/1 (1988), 84.
9. So P. Reymond, *L'eau, sa vie, et sa signification dans l'AT. SVT* 6 (1958), 148-49.
10. Ibid., 225.
11. H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 168.
12. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 501.

drawing water as a sign of joy of the sort familiar later in connection with the Feast of Tabernacles.[13]

The cult also included the regular service of "drawing water." In the multilayered and by no means unequivocal narrative in Josh. 9, the Gibeonites are condemned by the *n^e*ś*î'îm* in v. 21, and by Joshua in v. (23 and) 27, to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water *(šō'^a*ḇ*ê-mayim)* for all the congregation" (v. 21), "for the house of my God" (v. 23), "for the congregation and for the altar of Yahweh" (v. 27); here the temple and altar probably refer not to those in Gibeon but to those in Jerusalem.[14] The statement about the Gibeonites' service "for the congregation" belongs to a later, "priestly" stage of the text reflecting the fact that after the exile slaves of non-Israelite origin were degraded and engaged in work outside the temple.[15] The text does not disclose what specific tasks these water drawers performed.

The combination "hewers of wood" and "drawers of water" recurs only in Dt. 29:10(Eng. 11). In connection with the covenant promise (29:1-12[2-13]), we read that "you stand assembled today, all of you, before Yahweh your God — the leaders of your tribes, your elders, and your officials, all the men of Israel, your children, your women, and the aliens *(gēr)* who are in your camp, both those who cut your wood and those who draw your water *(šō'ēḇ mêmêḵā)*" (vv. 9-10[10-11]). This passage, like Josh. 9, doubtless refers to the Gibeonites, its apparent purpose[16] being to extract them from their function in the sanctuary and to separate them from Israel as *gērîm* while simultaneously integrating them into Israel's community.[17]

The intent of Dt. 29:10(11) is thus similar to that of the (later) text Josh. 9:21,27, which places the Gibeonites in the service of the "congregation."

The noun *maš'abbîm,* "watering places," occurs only in the Song of Deborah in the summons to sing Yahweh's praise (Jgs. 5:10-11): "Louder than[18] the cry of the water providers at the watering places, they [i.e., one] should praise the triumphs *(ṣiḏqôṯ)* of Yahweh" (v. 11aα).

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates *š'b* 3 times as *antleín* (Gen. 24:13,20; Isa. 12:3), otherwise generally (11 times) as *hydreúesthai* (*šō'ēḇ* in Dt. 29:10[11]; Josh. 9:21,27 as *hydrophóros;* in Josh. 9:23 the LXX omits the words "and drawers of water"). In Jgs. 5:11 it uses a form of *euphraínesthai,* and in Nah. 3:14 a form of *epispásthai.*

---

13. Ibid., 505-6.

14. J. Halbe, "Gibeon und Israel," *VT* 25 (1975) 632-33.

15. Ibid., 615.

16. Cf. J. Reiter, "Der Bundesschluss im Lande Moab" (diss., Vienna, 1984), 304.

17. Cf. A. D. H. Mayes, "Deuteronomy 29, Joshua 9, and the Place of the Gibeonites in Israel," in N. Lohfink, ed., *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft. BETL* 68 (1985), 321-25.

18. So J. A. Soggin, "Bemerkungen zum Deboralied, Richter Kap 5," *TLZ* 106 (1981) 630; idem, *Judges. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1972), 87, with reference to A. Weiser, "Das Deboralied," *ZAW* 71 (1959) 80.

2. *Qumran.* The only reliable Qumran witness is CD 11:1, where a Sabbath regulation prohibits drawing water in a container for drinking. Both the text and meaning of the occurrence in 1QH 3:29 are uncertain.[19]

Schmoldt

---

19. Cf. H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. SUNT* 4 (1966), 40-41 n. 11.

שָׁאַג *šā'ag;* שְׁאָגָה *š^e'āgâ*

Contents: I. Occurrences. II. Meaning and Use. III. Comparisons and Metaphors. IV. LXX. V. Qumran.

I. Occurrences. The root *š'g* occurs 27 times in the MT, including 20 times as a verb in the qal (Jgs. 14:5; Job 37:4; Ps. 22:14[Eng. 13]; 38:9[8]; 74:4; 104:21; Isa. 5:29; Jer. 2:15; 25:30[ter]; 51:38; Ezk. 22:25; Hos. 11:10[bis]; Joel 4:16[3:16]; Am. 1:2; 3:4,8; Zeph. 3:3) and 7 times as the derived subst. *š^e'āgâ* of the type *qaṭalat*[1] (Job 3:24; 4:10; Ps. 22:2[1]; 32:3; Isa. 5:29; Ezk. 19:7; Zech. 11:3). Moreover, one should probably also read *mš'gym* instead of *mš'yhm* in Ps. 35:17.[2] This root is also found in Ugaritic as *ṯigt*[3] and in Arabic as *ṯa'aǵa.*

II. Meaning and Use. The Ugaritic term *ṯigt* refers to the bellowing of a bull, Arab. *ṯa'aǧa* to the roaring of various animals. By contrast, in reference to animals Heb. *š'g* refers exclusively to the roar of the lion,[4] specifically of the young lion al-

---

šā'ag. G. J. Botterweck, "Gott und Mensch in den alttestamentlichen Löwenbildern," *Wort, Lied, und Gottespruch. FS J. Ziegler. FzB* 2 (1972), 117-28; R. Edler, *Das Kerygma des Propheten Zefanja. FThSt* 126 (1984), esp. 151-52; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 ([2]1977); J. M. Kennedy, "The Root *G'R* in the Light of Semantic Analysis," *JBL* 106 (1987) 47-64, esp. 54-55; G. Krinetzki, *Zefanjastudien. Regensburger Studien zur Theologie* 7 (1977), esp. 130; V. Maag, *Text, Wortschatz und Begriffswelt des Buches Amos* (Leiden, 1951), esp. 195-97; L. Markert, *Struktur und Bezeichnung des Scheltworts. BZAW* 140 (1977), esp. 86-94; H. Weippert, "Amos. Seine Bilder und ihr Milieu," in idem, K. Seybold, and M. Weippert, eds., *Beiträge zur prophetischen Bildsprache in Israel und Assyrien. OBO* 64 (1985), 1-29.

1. *BLe,* 463u″.
2. Cf. *BHS* and H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), in loc.
3. *KTU* 1.14, III, 16; V, 8 (original text, mistakenly altered to *ṯiqt*); *UT,* no. 2627; *WUS,* nos. 2448, 2822; *CML*[2], 160; cf. M. J. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 376, no. 595.
4. → אֲרִי *'ărî,* I, 374-88.

ready capable of bringing down prey (*kᵉpîr;* Jgs. 14:5; Ps. 104:21) as well as of the mature animal (*'ᵃrî/'aryēh* and *lāḇî';* Isa. 5:29; Am. 3:4,8). Accordingly, the term *šā'ag* occurs alongside *nāham* (Isa. 5:29), *nā'ar* I (Jer. 51:38), and *nāṯan qôl* (Jer. 2:15; Am. 3:4), and *šᵉ'āgâ* alongside *nᵉhāmâ* (Ps. 38:9[8] [cj.[5]]) and *qôl šāḥal* (Job 4:10).

The root is also applied to Yahweh (Jer. 25:30; Hos. 11:10; Am. 1:2; Joel 4:16[3:16], to his thundering voice (Job 37:4), to enemies (Ps. 74:4), or to the suffering petitioner (Job 3:24; Ps. 22:2[1]; 32:3). The term is probably being used metaphorically here.[6] A bridge between the two uses is the explicit comparison with the roaring of a lion (Ps. 22:14[13]; 38:9[8] [cj.]; Isa. 5:29; Jer. 51:38; Ezk. 22:25; Hos. 11:10; Zeph. 3:3).

Along with the bear, wolf, panther, and serpent, the lion was viewed as one of the most dangerous animals (Jer. 5:6; Am. 5:19). Its (nocturnal) roar indicates that it is hunting or pursuing prey (Ps. 104:20-22; cf. Isa. 5:29) or has already been successful in capturing that prey (Jer. 2:15; Am. 3:4). Because people also fall prey to lions (Am. 5:19; cf. Isa. 15:9; Ezk. 19:3,6), its roar causes fear in everyone (Am. 3:8; cf. Ezk. 19:7; Hos. 11:10).

III. Comparisons and Metaphors. "Among the figures using the lion," the roaring lion represents one of the "basic types of comparisons, metaphors, and images."[7]

1. Isaiah compares the cry of war of the "nation far away" (Isa. 5:26 [cj.; cf. *BHS*]), for which Yahweh "whistles," with the roar of a lion (v. 29), evoking thus three images: the fearful appearance of the foreign military power, its threatening intentions (it is after prey), and its dangerous nature. Just as is the case with an attacking lion, there can be no rescue. Commensurate with the absolute and radical nature of the Isaianic message (e.g., Isa. 6:9-11), this comparison expresses the inescapability of coming judgment. In Jer. 51:38 the roar of the Babylonians is evidence of their violent rapacity, which Yahweh will use at his judgment.

The term *šā'ag* can also express the enemy's triumph (Ps. 74:4). Just as the lion roars over its felled prey (Am. 3:4), so also the enemy roar within the "holy place" and "set up their emblems there" as signs of victory. The image of the lions roaring over their prey in Jer. 2:15 similarly illustrates Israel's situation, since Israel has indeed fallen prey to its enemies and lost its freedom (v. 14).

2. The petitioner's adversaries are also evoked in the image of the roaring lion (Ps. 35:17 [cj.; see above]). Ps. 22:14(13) refers to such hostile powers as bulls that encircle the petitioner, "open wide their mouths at me, like a ravening and roaring lion." This image illustrates the dangerous nature of these adversaries and the serious nature of the threat to which the petitioner is subject and the accompanying helplessness. This particular comparison may have been influenced by mythical imagery. Demonic beings

---

5. See III.4 below.
6. Maag, 195-96.
7. → I, 387.

threatening the welfare and health of the individual theriomorphically represent Israel's surroundings, for example, in the image of the lion.[8]

In Job 4:10 the roaring lion represents the wicked person.

3. The inappropriate behavior of certain groups within society can also be represented by the image of the roaring lion. Zeph. 3:3-4 issues accusations against Jerusalem according to estates; here the roaring lion (v. 3) represents the deadly, destructive rapacity of the *śārîm,* the highest state officials, an image prompted perhaps by early wisdom metaphors: "Like a roaring *(nāham)* lion or a charging bear is a wicked ruler over a poor people" (Prov. 28:15).

The book of Ezekiel picks up Zephaniah's comparison (Ezk. 22:25)[9] and intensifies it in a twofold manner. First, it refers it to the *n^eśî'îm* (cj.; cf. *BHS*), the kings themselves; second, this generalized condemnation of rulers reaches back beyond the present age to include the past in the accusation as well. The lion parable in Ezk. 19 employs the image of the roaring lion (v. 7) to illustrate the "awesome royal majesty [of Jehoiachin]"[10] (cf. also Prov. 19:12; 20:2).

4. In the language of the Psalms *šā'ag* and *š^e'āgâ* refer metaphorically to the intensity of the lament (Ps. 22:2[1]) and expression of suffering (Job 3:24 [with *ntk*]; Ps. 32:3), evoking thus the depth and power of the pain the psalmist must endure.[11] "I groan/roar [or: my groaning is] louder than the roaring of the 'lion' *lāḇî')*" (Ps. 38:9[8] [cj.]).[12] This use of *šā'ag* seems to have exerted an influence back on the image of the roaring lion. In the late scoffing or victory song in Zech. 11:1-3, which praises in anticipation the fall of the world power, the roaring of the lions together with the laments *(y^elālâ)* of the shepherds is an expression of sadness: "Listen, the roar of the lions, for the thickets of the Jordan are destroyed!" (v. 3).

5. The image of the roaring lion is also associated with Yahweh. The earliest witness is the originally independent[13] discourse in Am. 3:8: "The lion has roared; who will not fear? Yahweh has spoken; who can but prophesy?" The point of comparison in this juxtaposition is that the event inevitably evokes a certain reaction. Just as everyone becomes frightened at the roaring of the lion, so also must everyone prophesy when Yahweh speaks. The prophet's intention here is obviously to justify his own prophesying against criticisms from his listeners by adducing the impossibility of not transmitting, of holding back, or of otherwise keeping silent about the revealed word (cf. Jer. 20:9). Is the prophet also comparing Yahweh's speaking with the roaring of a lion?[14] This is perhaps first the case in Am. 1:2: "Yahweh roars from Zion, and utters his voice

---

8. Cf. Kraus, in loc.; O. Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans., New York, 1978), 78ff., "The Enemies of the Individual," esp. 85-89, "Animal Comparisons."

9. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 466-67, 468.

10. Ibid., 395.

11. Cf. Kraus, in loc.; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 126.

12. Cf. H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 161; *GesB,* 489; *HAL,* II, 515b.

13. Cf. W. H. Schmidt, "Die deuteronomistische Redaktion des Amosbuches," *ZAW* 77 (1965) 184-85; Markert, 88-89.

14. Markert, 93.

from Jerusalem." This verse, which is positioned at the beginning of Amos like a motto and whose authenticity is quite correctly questioned because of the mention of Zion,[15] describes God's appearance in the form of earlier theophany portrayals[16] but reverses its intention by understanding Yahweh's thunderous voice[17] in anticipation as the roar of a lion.[18] That is, Yahweh will not encounter Israel in a positive, saving fashion, but as disaster, "like a lion ready to pounce on its prey."[19] The interpretation was probably also inspired by the juxtaposition of *nāṯan qôl* and *šā'aḡ* in 3:4.[20]

Jer. 25:30, a doubtless non-Jeremianic[21] and probably only post-Dtr verse, picks up Am. 1:2. "Since Jerusalem and its Temple have in the meantime been destroyed, Yahweh's roaring voice issues from (the heavenly) 'on high' which is his 'holy habitation.'"[22] The verse also universally expands the horizon of Yahweh's appearance to include — quite beyond Judah/Jerusalem — other nations in the judgment (v. 31). Joel 4:16(3:16) presupposes and intensifies this expansion.[23] While Yahweh appears for judgment upon the nations, he remains "a refuge for his people, a stronghold for the people of Israel." Because the sanctuary has been rebuilt in the meantime (1:14; 2:17), the prophet can now pick up Am. 1:2a literally again. By contrast, Job 37:4 reverses the sequence of statements in Am. 1:2, as it were, and concentrates them in a single sentence; the subject of *šā'aḡ* is now Yahweh's thunderous voice *(qôl).*

Am. 1:2 may also provide the background for Hos. 11:10, a verse probably not going back to Hosea himself in view of the switch to the 3rd person for Yahweh and the mention of a western Diaspora.[24] "The calling father (vv. 1f.) now roars like a lion, with a voice that cannot be overheard. Though he does not call Israel to judgment, Israel returns home only in terror (cf. 3:4f.)."[25]

IV. LXX. The LXX translates *šā'aḡ* with various terms. The most frequent equivalent is *ōrýesthai* (Jgs. 14:5; Ps. 22:14[13]; 38:9[8]; 104:21; Jer. 2:15; Ezk. 22:25; Hos. 11:10; Zeph. 3:3). It also uses *ereúgesthai* (Hos. 11:10; Am. 3:4,8), *anakrázesthai* (Joel 4:16[3:16]), *boán* (Job 37:4), and *phthéngesthai* (Am. 1:2).

It translates the substantive as *ṓryma* (Ezk. 19:7) and *tó krázein* (Ps. 32:3), or paraphrases as *phōnḗ ōryoménōn leóntōn* (Zech. 11:3). In several passages the rendering

---

15. See W. H. Schmidt, 171-72 n. 9; H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 121-22; cf. Jeremias, 166-67.

16. Jeremias, 12-17, 130-33.

17. → קוֹל *qôl.*

18. Cf. Wolff, *Joel and Amos,* 118; W. Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 116-17; Jeremias, 168.

19. Maag, 197.

20. Cf. Weippert, 17.

21. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 167.

22. Wolff, *Joel and Amos,* 122.

23. Ibid., 81.

24. Cf. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 194-95; J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* 24/1 (1983), 147; W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 213-14.

25. Wolff, *Hosea,* 203.

resembles more an interpretation than a translation, e.g., *chrēmatízein* (Jer. 25:30 = 32:30 LXX), *exegeírein* (51:38 = 28:38 LXX), *enkauchásthai* (Ps. 74:4), *paráptōma* (Ps. 22:2[1]), *dakrýein* (Job 3:24), and *sthénos* (Job 4:10). In Isa. 5:29 both the substantive and the verb are replaced by completely different words (*ormán; paristánai).*[26]

V. Qumran. The root *š'g* occurs in Qumran in 11QPs[a] 19:8 = 11QPs[b] a,8,[27] an apocryphal psalm called a "plea for deliverance." At the beginning of a thanksgiving hymn, the psalmist explains: *š'gh npšy lhll 't šmkh.* The context shows that the verb has lost its original meaning and has now faded into an equivalent for the expression *nāśā'/nāṯan qôl.* The reason may be the parallel position of *šā'ag* and *nāṯan qôl* in Am. 3:4 and Jer. 2:15 (cf. Jer. 25:30; Joel 4:16[3:16]; Am. 1:2). Because contextual information is lacking, the meaning of the masc. pl. ptcp. *šw'gym* in the fragment 4Q172 9:2 can no longer be determined.

Graupner

26. But cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 223.
27. J. van der Ploeg, "Fragment d'un manuscrit de Psaumes de Qumran, 11QPsb," *RB* 74 (1967) 408-10.

שׁאה *š'h;* שׁוֹאָה *šô'â;* שָׁאוֹן *šā'ôn;* מְשׁוֹאָה *m^e^šô'â;* שְׁאִיָּה *š^e^'iyâ;* שְׁאֵת *šē'ṯ*

Contents: I. Occurrences and Meaning: 1. Occurrences; 2. Meaning. II. OT: 1. *š'h, šô'â/m^e^šô'â;* 2. *šā'ôn;* 3. Other Derivatives. III. Qumran. IV. LXX.

I. Occurrences and Meaning.

1. *Occurrences.* The vb. *š'h* along with its numerous derivatives is part of the specifically OT vocabulary and lacks corresponding terms in any of the related Semitic languages, even Aramaic. While occurrences in the Qumran writings (see III below) follow the term's use in the Hebrew Bible, more recently the derivative *šô'â* (Sho'ah, Shoah) has come to serve as a specialized designation for the unparalleled mass extermination of the Jews by the National Socialists, though even this usage is not without its critics within contemporary Jewish theology (cf. Hutner).

š'h. G. R. Driver, "Notes on Isaiah," *Von Ugarit nach Qumran. FS O. Eissfeldt. BZAW* 77 (1958), 42-48, esp. 42-43; Y. Hutner, "Bürde der Erwählung," in M. Brocke and H. Jochum, eds., *Wolkensäule und Feuerschein. Abhandlungen zum christlich-jüdischen Dialog* 13 (1982), 27-42, esp. 27, 40-41; S. H. Levey, "The Rule of the Community III,2," *RevQ* 5 (1964/65) 239-43; U. Tal, "Excursus on Hermeneutical Aspects of the Term Shoah," *Yad Vashem Studies* 13 (1979) 7-52.

2. *Meaning.* The verb occurs less frequently (once in the qal, 3 times in the niphal, twice in the hiphil) than do the substantival forms *šô'â* (12 times), *šā'ôn* (18), *m^e^šô'â* (3), and the hapax legomena *š^e^'îyâ* and *šē'ṯ*. The hithpael of *š'h* (II) occurring in Gen. 24:21 is to be distinguished from this verbal root and is viewed as a secondary form of *š'h.*[1]

The verb and its derivatives describe a noisy, roaring tumult sometimes associated with downfall (e.g., Isa. 66:6; Hos. 10:14; Zeph. 1:15), though they can also function as an image of joy and exuberance (Isa. 5:14) or power and strength (e.g., Ps. 65:8[Eng. 7]). As the result of downfall and disaster, they also refer to devastation and desolation.

II. OT.

1. *š'h, šô'â/m^e^šô'â.* The vb. *š'h* and the noun *šô'â* are part of the vocabulary of catastrophe. Even when they are used parallel with *hāmâ/hāmôn*[2] and refer to the roaring sound of masses of people or water (Ps. 65:8[7]; Isa. 17:12-13; Jer. 51:55), in most cases the setting involves destruction and downfall. The same applies to the translations "storm," "thunderstorm," and "darkness of clouds" (Prov. 1:27: *šô'â* par. *sûpâ;* Ezk. 38:9: *šô'â* par. *'ānān;* similarly Zeph. 1:15: *šô'â/m^e^šô'â* par. *ḥōšeḵ* and *'^a^pēlâ, 'ānān* and *'^a^rāpel*). Other elements of ruin include the devastation of inhabited cities (Isa. 6:11: *šā'û 'ārîm mē'ên yôšēḇ;* similarly 2 K. 19:25 par. Isa. 37:26) and the desolation of fertile landscapes (Job 30:3; 38:27). Such destruction (Isa. 10:3: *šô'â* par. *p^e^quddâ;* antonym: *'ezrâ*) can be brought about by hostile troops (Isa. 47:11, the fall of Babylon) as well as by personal adversaries (Ps. 63:10[9]; Job 30:14; perhaps also Ps. 35:17, though here the form *šô'* is usually corrected[3]). The same adversaries, however, can equally be the target of *šô'â* (Ps. 35:8; Prov. 3:25).

In three passages (Job 30:3; 38:27; Zeph. 1:15) *šô'â* is followed by *m^e^šô'â,* which derives from the same verbal root and which G. Fohrer describes as an "artificial expansion form."[4] This same sequence recurs in the hymns of Qumran (1QH 5:30; 9:6; see III below).

2. *šā'ôn.* The use of *šā'ôn* is more varied. Only in Ps. 40:3(2) does the word refer to "downfall" and "catastrophe" *(šā'ôn* par. *ṭîṭ hayyāwēn;* the response is *sela');* otherwise it refers to noise, tumult, or roaring in various contexts. For Isa. 5:14 and 24:8 *(šā'ôn* par. *'allēz/'allîz),* Gesenius's rendering as "merry, rollicking noise"[5] is certainly accurate. The initiators in 25:5 are portrayed more negatively. By contrast, a more threatening scene emerges with its warlike noise and Yahweh as the initiator of a hostile attack (13:4; 66:6; Hos. 10:14; cf. also Jer. 25:31). The portrayal in Am. 2:2 almost sounds naturalistic: "and Moab shall die amid uproar, amid shouting and the sound of

---

1. *GesB,* 796.
2. → III, 414-18.
3. See IV below.
4. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 413.
5. *GesB,* 797.

the trumpet."[6] In a neutral passage *šā'ôn* is used to refer to Pharaoh with the mocking name "Roaring, who missed his chance" (Jer. 46:17).[7] Jer. 51:55 describes the power of Babylon with the image of the roaring waves, power that is nonetheless destined to fall. Ps. 65:8(7) uses similar imagery to show that Yahweh is lord over the powers and forces of nature and the nations.

3. *Other Derivatives.* Other derivatives include *šᵉ'iyâ* and *šē'ṯ*. Isa. 24:12 uses *šᵉ'iyâ* parallel with *šammâ* in a portrayal resembling 6:11.[8] In Lam. 3:47 the hapax legomenon *šē'ṯ* together with three additional nouns related in content *(paḥaḏ, paḥaṯ, šeḇer)* describes the disconsolate state of Jerusalem after its destruction.

The interpretation of the hapax legomenon *šēṯ* in Nu. 24:17 is disputed. Although "Moab" in the preceding line militates in favor of the PN "Sheth," B. Baentsch adduces the parallel text Jer. 48:45, where *šā'ôn* stands instead, and considers whether *šēṯ* might not be an abbreviated form of *šē'ṯ* (Lam. 3:47; see above).[9] Other interpreters read *śᵉ'ēṯ,* "arrogance."[10] G. Hoffmann suggests yet another solution, namely, to understand the word as a reference to the acropolis of Ar-Moab.[11] Baentsch, however, is probably correct in suggesting that "at least for now, nothing certain can be determined."[12]

III. Qumran. In the Qumran writings the substantival derivatives of *š'h* are part of the vocabulary of religious poetry. All these occurrences are found in the Hymn Scroll (concerning 1QS 3:2, see Levey). 1QH 2:27 and 6:7 use *šā'ôn* parallel with *hāmôn,* the comparison with roaring masses of water *(kahᵃmôn mayim rabbîm)* recalling Isa. 17:12-13. 1QH 5:30 and 9:6 use the parallel *šô'â/mᵉšô'â* to refer to the petitioner's personal tribulations.[13] 1QH 5:22 makes the same statement with *šā'ôn.*

IV. LXX. It is difficult to determine the corresponding LXX equivalents for these verbal and substantival forms. In part the textual tradition goes its own way or replaces the Hebrew words with completely different Greek words.

In Ps. 35:8 the LXX views *šô'â* as a parallel to *rešeṯ* and thus renders it as *pagís* alongside *thḗra,* "net, trap."[14] In Ps. 35:17 the LXX presupposes the reading *šāw'* ("deceitfulness, lie"[15]) for the abbreviated form *šô'* and accordingly translates *kakourgía.*

The LXX does, however, uses clear equivalents for the basic meanings. It renders the roaring of the masses of water or people as *ēcheín* (Isa. 17:12-13) or *ḗchos* (Ps. 65:8[7]), and the noise of battles as *kraugḗ* (Isa. 66:6; Am. 2:2). It refers to the down-

---

6. See T. H. Robinson *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. HAT* I/14 (²1954), 76.
7. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 270.
8. → שמם *šmm.*
9. *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri. HKAT* I/2 (1903), 616-17.
10. → נשא *nāśā'.*
11. "Versuche zu Amos," *ZAW* 3 (1883) 97.
12. Baentsch, 617.
13. See II.1 above.
14. *BAGD,* 360.
15. *GesB,* 809.

fall or destruction associated with such sounds as *apṓleia* (Isa. 47:11; Hos. 10:14), *thlípsis* (Isa. 10:3), *synochḗ* (Job 30:3), or *talaipōría* (Ps. 40:3[2]; Zeph. 1:15), and renders the corresponding verbal form of *šʾh* as *erēmoún* (Isa. 6:11). Finally, it renders the double expression *šôʾâ ûmešôʾâ* in Job 38:27 as *ábaton kaí aoíkēton.*

Beyse

שְׁאוֹל *šeʾôl*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. OT Occurrences; 3. LXX. II. Sheol as a Place in the Depths. III. Parallel Expressions: 1. *bôr;* 2. *šaḥaṯ;* 3. *ʾereṣ;* 4. *qeḇer;* 5. *ʿāp̄ār;* 6. *ʾaḇaddôn;* 7. *māweṯ.* IV. Characteristics of the Underworld. V. Theological Meaning: 1. Distance from Yahweh; 2. Removal to the Underworld as Punishment; 3. Fear of Sheol and Rescue from It; 4. Yahweh's Power over the Underworld. VI. Qumran.

šeʾôl. W. F. Albright, "Mesopotamian Elements in Canaanite Eschatology," *FS P. Haupt* (Baltimore, 1926), 143-54; idem, review of M. H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts* (Leiden, 1955), *JBL* 75 (1956) 255-57; T. D. Alexander, "The OT View of Life after Death," *Themelios* 11 (1986) 41-46; idem, "The Psalms and the Afterlife," *Irish Biblical Studies* 9 (1987) 2-17; C. Barth, *Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des AT* (Zurich, [2]1987); W. Baumgartner, "Zur Etymologie von schᵉʾōl," *TZ* 2 (1946) 233-35; H. Bietenhard, "Hell, etc.," in C. Brown, ed., *New International Dictionary of NT Theology* (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1976), II:205-10; B. C. Cresson, "The Afterlife in OT Thought," *BI* 13 (1987) 70-73; E. Dévaud, "Sur l'étymologie de שְׁאוֹל *šeʾôl,*" *Sphinx* 13 (1910) 120-21; J. A. Emerton, "Sheol and the Sons of Belial," *VT* 37 (1987) 214-18; H. Ferenczy, "Scheol. Untersuchung des Begriffs" (diss., Vienna, 1975); G. Fohrer, *History of Israelite Religion* (Eng. trans., Nashville, 1972), esp. 219-20; T. H. Gaster, "Dead, Abode of the," *IDB,* I, 787-88; G. Gerleman, "שְׁאוֹל *šeʾôl* realm of the dead," *TLOT,* III, 1279-82; M. Görg, "'Scheol' — Israels Unterweltsbegriff und seine Herkunft," *BN* 17 (1982) 26-34; A. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and OT Parallels* (Chicago, [2]1949), esp. 170-91; M. Hutter, *Altorientalische Vorstellungen von der Unterwelt: Literar- und religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu "Nergal und Ereškigal." OBO* 63 (1985); J. Jeremias, "ᾅδης," *TDNT,* I, 146-49; O. Kaiser and E. Lohse, *Death and Life* (Eng. trans., Nashville, 1981), esp. 12-91; L. Köhler, "Alttestamentliche Wortforschung: Schᵉʾōl," *TZ* 2 (1946) 71-74; F. König, *Zarathustras Jenseitsvorstellungen und das AT* (Vienna, 1964), esp. 186-97, 212-15, 220-27; H.-J. Kraus, "Hölle II. Im AT und Judentum," *RGG,* III, 403-4; S. E. Loewenstamm, "שְׁאוֹל," *EMiqr,* VII, 454-57; T. J. Long, "Life after Death, the Biblical View," *TBT* 20 (1982) 329-37, 341-53, 362-63; G. Madamana, "Afterlife in the OT," *Bible-bhashyam* 11 (1985) 5-9; R. Martin-Achard, *De la mort à la résurrection d'après l'AT* (Neuchâtel, 1956), esp. 36-43; idem, *La mort en face selon la Bible hébraïque. Essais bibliques* 15 (Geneva, 1988), esp. 72-83; V. Moro, "*šeʾol;* indagine sulla terminologia dell-aldilà nell'AT" (diss., Florence, 1979); T. Podella, "Grundzüge alttestamentlicher Jenseitsvorstellungen: שְׁאוֹל," in P. Xella, ed., *Archeologia dell'inferno* (Verona, 1987), 163-90 (Italian) = *BN* 43 (1988) 70-89; H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1966), esp. 239-47, 322-23; H. Schmid, "Tod II. Tod und Totenreich im AT," *RGG,* VI, 912-13; W. von Soden, "Assyriologische Erwägungen zu einem neuen Buch über die Totenreichvorstellung im AT," *UF* 2 (1970) 331-32; K. Spronk, *Beatific Afterlife in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East. AOAT* 219 (1986); H.-P. Stähli, "Tod und Leben im AT,"

I. 1. *Etymology.* The noun *šᵉʾôl* is found only in Hebrew, though it does also appear as a loanword in Syriac, Aramaic, and Ethiopic.[1] Note also the Eblaite place name *ši-a-la*[ki].[2]

The etymology of *šᵉʾôl* has long been the subject of scholarly discussion. Derivations from *šāʾal,* "inquire," emerged early and remained popular.[3] The meaning would then be "(place of) inquiry." Such a meaning, however, presupposes a court of the dead, something not attested in the OT. Attempts to derive the word from an assumed term *šāʿal,* "hollow out," have been abandoned.[4]

F. Delitzsch and W. Baumgartner have tried to derive the term from Akkadian, though *šuʾalu,* suggested by Delitzsch as an Akkadian designation for the underworld, is based on a misreading of the cuneiform.[5] Baumgartner followed the lead of W. F. Albright by beginning with Akk. *šuʾāra,* which originally referred to the dwelling of Tammuz in the underworld and then allegedly became the designation for the underworld itself. This view, however, seems far-fetched and does not hold up under closer scrutiny.[6]

The same certainly applies to E. Dévaud's attempt to derive *šᵉʾôl* from Egyptian, and to W. Wifall's assumption of an indirect loan from Egyptian such that *šiḥôr,* "pond of Horus," is to be equated with the Sea of Reeds *(yam-sûp),* which in Egyptian mythology exhibited features of the underworld. This underworld function was then allegedly transferred to El, leading to the underworld designation *šᵉʾēl,* "lake of El," which was later vocalized as *šᵉʾôl.*

L. Köhler has found wide acceptance in suggesting that *šᵉʾôl* derives from → שׁאה *šʾh* I, whereby the final *l* is not part of the stem, but rather an element of construction as in *karmel,* "fruit garden." The root *šʾh* has several distinct meanings, including (1) be desolate; (2) roar, rage; (3) regard. Köhler adduces only the first meaning, which is consonant with the desolation of the underworld. G. Gerleman tries to combine the two aspects "in the concept of disorder and disorganization manifest acoustically as noise and visually as ruin."[7] Regardless of how one construes the semantic differences within

---

Theologie und Glaube 76 (1986) 173-92; K. L. Tallqvist, *Sumerisch-akkadische Namen der Totenwelt. StOr* V/4 (1934); N. J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the OT. BietOr* 21 (1969), esp. 21-151; J. Tropper, *Nekromantie. Totenbefragung im Alten Orient und im AT. AOAT* 223 (1989); L. Wächter, *Der Tod im AT. AzT* II/8 (1967), esp. 48-56, 181-98; idem, "Unterweltsvorstellungen und Unterweltsnamen in Babylonien, Israel und Ugarit," *MIO* 15 (1969) 327-36; W. Wifall, "The Sea of Reeds as Sheol," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 325-32.

1. *LexSyr,* 773; *DNSI,* II, 1095; *AP* 71.15; *LexLingAeth,* 376-77.

2. G. Pettinato, *Catalogo dei testi cuneiformi di Tell Mardikh-Ebla. Materiali Epigrafici di Ebla* 1 (Naples, 1979), 1027, who finds 2 feminine occurrences; cf. M. Dahood, "Love and Death at Ebla and Their Biblical Reflections," *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East. FS M. H. Pope* (Guilford, Conn., 1987), 97.

3. *GesTh,* 1348; König, 474; Albright, *JBL* 75 (1956) 257; C. H. Gordon, *Eblaitica,* I (Winona Lake, Ind., 1987), 24.

4. *GesTh,* 1348.

5. P. Jensen, *Die Kosmologie der Babylonier* (Strassburg, 1890), 222-24; von Soden.

6. Albright, "Mesopotamian Elements."

7. Gerleman, 1280.

the derivatives of *šʾh,* it is nonetheless doubtful whether *šeʾôl* does belong to this group; it is thus better to treat it as a word sui generis.

A derivation focusing on a separation into the constituent parts *š* and *ʾôl* is worthy of consideration.[8] On this view *šeʾôl* might derive from an earlier *šeʾāl,* with the naturally long *ā* in the prominent syllable becoming *ō* in Old Canaanite.[9] In Hebrew as well as in other Semitic languages, *ʾal* is widespread as a negation that was originally a substantive with the meaning "nothing."[10] One would presuppose the fuller vocalization *ʾāl* for this substantive. The *š* may represent an old preformative, as occasionally attested in Hebrew.[11] If one understands it as a causative element, *šeʾôl* would then mean "make into nothing, destroy"; if one understands it in the sense of a relative pronoun, then commensurate with Akk. *šu* the meaning "belonging to nothingness" or "place of nothingness" emerges.[12] I believe the latter meaning is preferable.

2. *OT Occurrences.* The term *šeʾôl* occurs 66 times in the OT counting Isa. 7:11, where *šeʾālâ* is to be emended to *šeʾōlâ.* Here, as in 1 K. 2:6 and Job 17:16, the word is written without the *waw,* whereas it otherwise always appears as *šeʾôl.* It occurs with widely varying frequency in the OT books. The greatest concentration is found in the Ketubim, including 16 times in the Psalms, 8 in Job, 9 in Proverbs, and 1 each in Canticles and Ecclesiastes, totaling 35 occurrences. Among the prophets, Isaiah predominates with 10 occurrences, then Ezekiel with 5; the word occurs 5 times in the Minor Prophets, not at all in Jeremiah. It also occurs 4 times in Genesis, twice in Numbers, once in Deuteronomy, twice in 1 Kings, and once each in 1 and 2 Samuel.

3. *LXX.* The LXX consistently translates *šeʾôl* as *hádēs* (60 times). It translates it as *thánatos* 3 times (2 S. 22:6; Prov. 23:14; Isa. 28:15). In the case of Isa. 28:15, the parallel terms for "death" and "underworld" have merely been switched in the translation. In 2 S. 22:6 it renders both as *thánatos,* while Ps. 18:6(Eng. 5), which is otherwise identical with 2 S. 22:6, retains the parallelism in the LXX as well. Ezk. 32:21 uses *bóthros,* "pit, trench," for *šeʾôl.* The LXX formulates the text in Isa. 7:11 more briefly, and thus it lacks an equivalent for *šeʾālâ.* The text of Job 24:19 is problematic.

II. Sheol as a Place in the Depths. Like other peoples in antiquity, from the Greeks to the Babylonians, the OT Israelites conceived the world of the dead as a great space in the depths, as an underworld. The spirits of the dead[13] (Job 26:5; Prov. 9:18; Isa. 14:9) enter into this realm of darkness (Job 10:21; Ps. 88:7,13[6,12]; etc.) and silence

8. Wächter, "Unterweltsvorstellungen," 335.
9. Meyer, I, §23.1a.
10. *HAL,* I, 48.
11. Meyer, II, §40.6.
12. *AHw,* III, 1254.
13. → רפאים *repāʾîm.*

(Ps. 22:3[2]; 94:17) that is closed off with locks and gates (Job 38:17; Ps. 9:14[13]; Isa. 38:10) and from which there is no return (Job 7:9; 16:22; Jon. 2:7[6]; cf. in this regard the Sumerian name of the realm of the dead, *kur-nu-gi-a,* Akk. *erṣet lā tāri,* "land without return"). Although there is neither activity nor consciousness there (Eccl. 9:10), the dead do retain in a shadowy way the same forms they had at death or burial. Rank and class continue to be valid. Kings reign with the signs of their office (Isa. 14:9ff.), warriors still wear their equipment (Ezk. 32:27), and the prophet his cloak (1 S. 28:14). Those who were denied a proper burial must lie down on maggots and be covered with worms (Isa. 14:11). The spirits of the dead who were uncircumcised and slain with the word (murdered or executed) receive a place commensurate with the inferior place of the corpse (Isa. 14:19; Ezk. 31:17-18; 32:19ff.). Despite such distinctions, however, even the poetic portrayal of the excitement of the realm of the dead when the king of Babylon descends speaks about the equality of the spirits of the dead, all of whom are equally weak (Isa. 14:9-10).

The location of Sheol in the depths already becomes clear from the verbal expressions used to describe one's descent into it, which almost always include forms of → ירד *yāraḏ* IV, "climb down, descend" (9 times in the qal, 7 in the hiphil, 2 in the hophal). An even stronger expression is *špl* hiphil together with *šlḥ,* "send far down" (Isa. 57:9), similarly *nḥt* (Job 21:13; together with *ʿāpār* in Job 17:16b), "sink down." Other verbs of movement are used in Am. 9:2 (*ḥtr,* "break through"), Ps. 9:18(17) *(šûḇ),* and Eccl. 9:10 *(hālaḵ).*

The depth of Sheol is underscored by the addition of *taḥtîṯ* (Dt. 32:22) or *taḥtîyâ* (Ps. 86:13; cf. Sir. 51:6), "lowest/deepest Sheol," or through the expression *ʿimqê šᵉʾôl,* "depths of Sheol" (Prov. 9:18). Contrasting juxtapositions include *šāmayim,* "heaven," and *šᵉʾôl,* in reference to the highest and lowest realms of the cosmos (Job 11:8; Ps. 139:8; Am. 9:2; cf. Isa. 7:11).

III. Parallel Expressions.

1. *bôr.* According to the Israelite worldview, Sheol lies beneath the subterranean ocean upon which the earth disk floats (cf. Job 26:5; 38:16-17). The path to it leads through deep water, hence it is not surprising that *bôr,* "cistern, water pit,"[14] is one of the most frequent names for the underworld in the OT, a name used in part in place of *šᵉʾôl* itself and in part alongside *šᵉʾôl* in *parallelismus membrorum.* Such parallelism is found in Ps. 30:4(3); 88:4b,5a(3b,4a); Prov. 1:12; Isa. 14:15; Ezk. 31:16. The two terms are used in close proximity in Isa. 38:18; Ezk. 31:14b,15a, etc. The characteristic expression for descent into the underworld in Israel is the idiom *yôrᵉḏê-ḇôr,* "those who go down to the Pit" (Ps. 28:1; 30:4[3]; 88:5[4]; 143:7; Prov. 1:12; Isa. 38:18; Ezk. 26:20; 31:14,16; 32:18,24,25,29,30). An expression analogous to *šᵉʾôl taḥtîṯ* or *šᵉʾôl taḥtîyâ* is *bôr taḥtîyôṯ* (Ps. 88:7[6]; Lam. 3:55), "lowest pit," corresponding, e.g., to *yarkᵉṯê-ḇôr,* "depths of the Pit" (Isa. 14:15; Ezk. 32:23).

---

14. → באר *bᵉʾēr* III (I, 465-66); better: → ירד *yāraḏ* V (VI, 319-20); *HAL,* I, 106, "watering place, well of underground water."

2. *šaḥaṯ*. Another synonym for *šᵉʼôl* similar to *bôr* is → שׁחת *šaḥaṯ*, another word for "pit," albeit one that also includes the concrete notion of the pit as a trap.[15] The term *šaḥaṯ* can also evoke the notion of the grave. For example, the meaning of *šaḥaṯ* in Ps. 16:10 is clear since it parallels *šᵉʼôl:* "For you do not give me up to Sheol, or let your faithful one see the Pit *(šaḥaṯ)*." Given the context, however, Jon. 2:7(6) also clearly alludes to the underworld with reference to the pit *(šaḥaṯ)* out of which the petitioner is led. The same applies to the "pit of destruction" *(šaḥaṯ bᵉlî)* from which the author of Isa. 38:17 was preserved, a passage followed by several references to the underworld (v. 18: *šᵉʼôl, māweṯ, yôrᵉḏê-ḇôr*). Even in passages using *šaḥaṯ* instead of the usual *bôr* in the expression "go down to the pit" (Ps. 30:10[9]; 55:24[23] [*liḇʼēr šaḥaṯ*]; Ezk. 28:8), the reference is to the journey into the underworld.

In some passages (e.g., Job 17:14; 33:18,22,24,28,30), *šaḥaṯ* more likely refers to the grave than to the underworld.

3. *ʼereṣ*. In ancient Babylonia "earth," *erṣetu,* was the most popular and frequent name for the underworld.[16] It was used not only in reference to the underworld itself but also for attributes of the gods of the underworld, e.g., *bēlit erṣeti,* "mistress of the earth," for the goddess of the underworld, Ereshkigal.

In ancient Ugarit, too, "earth," *ʼrṣ,* often means essentially "underworld." "Descend to the depth of the earth" always means "descend into the underworld." The expression *yrdm ʼrṣ* corresponds exactly to Heb. *yôrᵉḏê-ḇôr.*[17] In ancient Israel, however, the word for "earth" was not understood as a synonym for "underworld" to the same extent as in Ugarit or Babylon.

The word *ʼereṣ* refers to the underworld especially when a corresponding qualification is made, for example, "whose bars closed upon me forever" (Jon. 2:7[6]), or with expressions corresponding to Akk. *erṣetu šaplītu,* "the lower earth," and referring to the depths,[18] including *ʼereṣ taḥtîṯ,* "the world below" (Ezk. 31:14,16,18), and *taḥtîyôṯ hāʼāreṣ,* "depths of the earth" (or something similar; Ps. 63:10[9]; Isa. 44:23; Ezk. 26:20; 32:18,24). It should be noted that Ps. 139:15 does speak of this realm, but as the hidden place where human beings were created, which has nothing to do with the realm of the dead. On the other hand, expressions such as *tᵉhōmôṯ hāʼāreṣ,* the "primal waters of the earth" (Ps. 71:20), and *meḥqᵉrê-ʼāreṣ,* "depths of the earth" (Ps. 95:4), do indeed allude to the underworld or to its access.

Rarely, however, does mere *ʼereṣ* alone refer to the underworld. Eccl. 3:21 juxtaposes the ascent of the human spirit/breath and the descent of the spirit/breath of animals. In this case *lᵉmāʻlâ,* "upward," doubtless means "to heaven," while *lᵉmaṭṭâ lāʼāreṣ,* "down beneath the earth," accordingly means "to the underworld." Given the context in Isa. 26:19, the statement "the earth will give birth to the shades" (*npl* hiphil) means that the dead will emerge from the underworld, an element of hope transcending

15. *KBL*², 963.
16. See Tallqvist, 8-14.
17. *KTU* 1.4, VIII, 8-9; *ANET,* 135a, viii, 8-9; *KTU* 1.5, V, 15-16; *ANET,* 139a, v, 15-16.
18. → ארץ *ʼereṣ (ʼerets)* II.3 (I, 199-200).

the old understanding of Sheol. In Ps. 22:30(29) (emended text) the expressions *yešēnê-ʾereṣ*, "who sleep in the earth," and *yôredê ʿāp̄ār*, "who go down to the dust," are parallel.

4. *qeḇer*. The word for "grave," → קבר *qeḇer*, can also assume the meaning of "underworld," albeit only rarely. One clear witness is Ps. 88:12(11), where *qeḇer* parallels *ʾaḇaddôn*, "realm of the dead." Ezk. 32:22-26 describes the circular arrangement of the graves of Assyria, Elam, and Meshech-Tubal in the underworld; here the notion of grave is transferred to the underworld.

5. *ʿāp̄ār*. Burial sites in ancient Palestine were niche graves allowing one to ascertain the decay of the remains to dust when the graves were reused. This practice is associated with the notion equating the dead with dust (Ps. 30:10[9]) or with referring to the deceased as "dwellers in the dust" (Isa. 26:19) and as those who "lie down in the dust" (Job 7:21; 20:11; 21:26).[19] Although the reference is first of all to the grave, "dust" can just as easily function as an expression for the "underworld." Such is the case in Job 17:16, which parallels "go down to the bars of Sheol" and "descend into the dust." The parallel to "will the dust praise you?" in Ps. 30:10(9) is "what profit is there in my death, if I go down to the Pit *(šaḥaṯ)*?" a reference to the journey to the underworld, expressed in Ps. 22:30(29) by "go down to the dust" *(yrd ʿāp̄ār)*. Given the context, the "dwellers in the dust" *(šôḵenê ʿāp̄ār)* in Isa. 26:19 are those who dwell in the underworld, and the "land of the dust" *(ʾaḏmaṯ-ʿāp̄ār)* from which many will awaken is nothing other than the underworld (Dnl. 12:2). The corresponding Akkadian expression is *bît epri*.[20]

6. *ʾaḇaddôn*. Later OT writings use yet another designation for the realm of the dead instead of or alongside *šeʾôl*, namely, *ʾaḇaddôn*,[21] in the meaning "downfall" (so Job 31:12) or "place of downfall." In three passages (Job 26:6; Prov. 15:11; 27:20, which reads *ʾaḇaddōh*), it parallels *šeʾôl*, once (Ps. 88:12[11]) *qeḇer*, and once (Job 28:22) *māweṯ*.

7. *māweṯ*. Because thoughts of death conjure the idea of the underworld and vice versa, the word for "death," *māweṯ*, frequently appears in connection with statements about the underworld.[22] The term *māweṯ* often parallels *šeʾôl* (Ps. 6:6[5]; 18:6[5] par. 2 S. 22:6; Ps. 49:15[14]; 55:16[15]; 89:49[48]; 116:3; Prov. 5:5; 7:27; Cant. 8:6; Isa. 28:15,18; 38:18; Hos. 13:14; Hab. 2:5; par. to *ʾaḇaddôn* in Job 28:22). This connection can occur in various contexts. Sometimes it refers to the "sphere of death" during life-threatening events (Ps. 18:6[5] par. 2 S. 22:6; Ps. 116:3; Hos. 13:14); it can also evoke the descent into the underworld (Ps. 55:16[15]), especially in the proverbs about the

---

19. → עפר *ʿāp̄ār* IV.4, 5 (XI, 264-65).
20. Tallqvist, 37; *AHw*, I, 223.
21. → אבד *ʾāḇaḏ (ʾābhadh)* V (I, 23).
22. → מות *mûṯ* VIII.2 (VIII, 205-6)

strange woman who leads a man to ruin (Prov. 5:5; 7:27). Finally, it appears in laments about the underworld's distance from God (Ps. 6:6[5]; Isa. 38:18). Death and the underworld can also serve as points of comparison for insatiability (Hab. 2:5) or for the power of Eros (Cant. 8:6). They can also underscore the transitoriness of life (Ps. 89:49[48]) or the ultimate fate of the rich (49:15[14]).

Isa. 28:15 and 18 are difficult to interpret. Here the prophet turns against enemies who have made a covenant with death *(bᵉrîṯ ʾeṯ-māweṯ)* and an agreement with Sheol *(ḥāzûṯ ʾeṯ-šᵉʾôl).* Are they being accused of having "secured" themselves through magic in case of collapse, or of having turned to an underworld god, Canaanite Mot or Egyptian Osiris? The only thing one can say for sure is that the scoffers are behaving as if the threatening danger symbolized by the "raging flood" *(šôṭ šôṭēp̄)* cannot harm them.[23]

IV. Characteristics of the Underworld. Precisely in connection with *māweṯ,* the OT uses a wealth of expressions to refer to various characteristics of the underworld or to illuminate the harshness of death with respect to the underworld. The Israelites imagined the underworld to be locked with gates, whence the reference to the "gates of Sheol" (*šaʿᵃrê šᵉʾôl,* Isa. 38:10; cf. Wis. 16:13), the "gates of death" (*šaʿᵃrê māweṯ,* Job 38:17; Ps. 9:14[13]; 107:18), or the "gates of darkness" (*šaʿᵃrê ṣalmāweṯ,* Job 38:17). Because they conceived the underworld to be an organized space (cf. Ezk. 32:22-26), the paths to it (Prov. 7:27) led into "chambers of death" *(ḥaḏrê-māweṯ).*

The underworld holds fast to those who enter it, whence the reference to the "cords of Sheol" (*ḥeḇlê šᵉʾôl,* Ps. 18:6[5] par. 2 S. 22:6) or "cords of death" (*ḥeḇlê-māweṯ,* Ps. 18:5[4]; 116:3); another metaphor mentions the "hand of the underworld" (*yaḏ-šᵉʾôl,* 49:16[15]; 89:49[48]; Hos. 13:14). References to the "snares of death" *(môqᵉšê māweṯ)* evoke the deceitfulness of death (Ps. 18:6[5] par. 2 S. 22:6; Prov. 13:14; 14:27).

Other metaphors for the threatening sphere of the underworld include *mišbᵉrê-māweṯ,* "waves of death" (2 S. 22:5), *naḥᵃlê bᵉlîyaʿal,* "torrents of Belial" (2 S. 22:5; Ps. 18:5[4]),[24] and other metaphors of distress in water.

Poetically the inevitability of death was expressed as the underworld's insatiability (Prov. 27:20; 30:16). Isa. 5:14 describes how "Sheol has enlarged its appetite and opened its mouth beyond measure" *(hirḥîḇâ šᵉʾôl napšâ ûp̄āʿᵃrâ p̄îhā liḇlî-ḥōq).* In Ps. 141:7 the wicked are threatened with having their bones strewn at the mouth of Sheol *(lᵉp̄î šᵉʾôl);* and Nu. 16:28ff., the account of the death of Dathan and Abiram, portrays just such an event. Here the ground itself splits apart under them (v. 31), the earth opens its mouth *(wattiptaḥ hāʾāreṣ ʾeṯ-pîhā)* and swallows them *(wattiḇlaʿ ʾōṯām),* so they go down alive into the underworld (*šᵉʾôl*) (vv. 32-33).

One group of designations for the underworld takes the condition of this realm as a point of departure for coining such expressions as *ʾaḏmaṯ-ʿāp̄ār,* "land of dust" (Dnl.

---

23. See O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 251-52.
24. → בליעל *bᵉliyyaʿal* II.1 (II, 134).

12:2), *ʾereṣ nᵉšîyâ,* "land of forgetfulness" (Ps. 88:13[12]), and *ʾereṣ ḥōšek̠ wᵉṣalmāwet̠,* "land of gloom and deep darkness" (Job 10:21).[25]

Expressions of this sort emphasizing a particular aspect of the underworld can also appear in abbreviated form, and this practice is actually more common in the OT. Instead of "land of darkness" (cf. Akk. *bît ekleti* or *bît eṭē*[26]), one reads simply *ḥōšek̠* (Job 17:13; 18:18; Ps. 88:13[12]) or *ṣalmāwet̠* (Job 38:17), "darkness," or *maḥᵃšakkîm* (Ps. 88:7[6]; 143:3), "dark regions." Alongside *ʿāpār,* "dust,"[27] another brief designation for the underworld is *dûmâ,* "silence" (22:3[2]; 94:17).

Job is the only book using the designation *bayit̠,* "house,"[28] for example, in 30:23 in the poetic formulation *bêt̠ môʿēd̠ lᵉk̠ōl-ḥāy,* the "house appointed for all living," or 17:13 in the lament *šᵉʾôl bêt̠î,* "Sheol as my house." On the other hand, Eccl. 12:5 (cf. Ps. 49:12[11]) refers to the grave as the *bêt̠ ʿôlām,* the "eternal home."

V. Theological Meaning. The notion of Sheol is theologically significant in that being banned to Sheol creates distance from God. Hence metaphors of the underworld express anxiety in the face of death as well as the experience of being saved from great distress. On the other hand, death imposed by God as punishment can be portrayed as being cast into the underworld.

1. *Distance from Yahweh.* Other peoples in antiquity conceived of the underworld as the seat of one or several gods. In Ugarit it was Mot, in Babylonia Ereshkigal and Nergal. That is, they did not believe that the spirits of the dead had no relationship at all with the gods. By contrast, because Israel worships Yahweh alone as God, and because Yahweh's seat is in heaven and his sphere of activity is heaven and earth, the underworld has no God in Israelite understanding.

Although some OT passages seem to personify death (*māwet̠,* e.g., Job 18:14; Ps. 49:15[14]), such usage is poetical, and although passages occasionally speak of how Yahweh's power extends even into the underworld (Job 26:6; Ps. 139:8; Am. 9:2), such statements represent borderline assertions that were risked only late in Israel's history.

The general view was that Yahweh has nothing to do with the deceased and that the latter have no community with him. This situation comes to deeply distressed expression in laments and thanksgivings, most fully in Ps. 88, and especially in vv. 11-13(10-12): "Do you work wonders for the dead? Do the shades *(rᵉpāʾîm)* rise up to praise you? Is your steadfast love declared in the grave, or your faithfulness in the realm of the dead *(bāʾᵃb̠addôn)*? Are your wonders known in the darkness, or your saving help in the land of forgetfulness?" Isa. 38:18 says analogously: "Sheol cannot thank you, death cannot praise you; those who go down to the Pit cannot hope for your faithfulness." The idea that no one can praise God from the underworld (so also Ps. 115:17; cf.

25. → חשך *ḥāšak̠* IV.4 (V, 255-56).
26. Tallqvist, 37.
27. See III.5 above.
28. → בית *bayit̠ (bayith)* IV (I, 113).

Sir. 17:27-28) is one of the most important arguments in Ps. 6:6(5) and 30:10(9) that the petitioner presents in trying to prompt God's intervention.

Job 14:13 shows a different attitude toward this notion in the entreaty, "Oh, that you would hide me in Sheol, that you would conceal me until your wrath is past." This passage, however, is doubtless using the word *šᵉʼôl* figuratively to designate an inaccessible hiding place (cf. Ps. 139:8; Am. 9:2).

2. *Removal to the Underworld as Punishment.* Divine punishment on those who oppose God's will is often portrayed as being cast down into the underworld. Striking examples include the portrayal of the death of Dathan and Abiram (Nu. 16:28ff.); Isa. 5:14, where the underworld opens its mouth wide and devours a group of arrogant people; the dirge of Isa. 14:4-21 with its description of the underworld; the oracle against Tyre (Ezk. 26:19-21); and the prophet's dirge over Egypt (Ezk. 32:17-32) and Pharaoh (31:1-18). Such portrayals of the underworld are always either the final culmination or a drastic evocation of terrifying divine judgment.

Numerous passages from the Psalms (9:18[17]; 31:18[17]; 49:15[14]; 55:16,24 [15,23]; 63:10[9]; 141:7) express the petitioner's wish that the wicked go to the underworld (cf. also 1 K. 2:6,9). Several Proverbs (2:18-19; 5:5; 7:27; 9:18; 15:24; 21:16) present the path into the underworld as the consequence of bad conduct.

3. *Fear of Sheol and Rescue from It.* The image of the underworld occupies considerable space in portrayals of petitioners' distress in the Psalms. The image generally represents the culmination and final expression of present or past mortal danger. Petitioners say they are close to the underworld (Ps. 88:4[3]; Sir. 51:6; cf. Job 33:22), have come to its gates (Isa. 38:10), indeed, that they are already among those who go down to the Pit (Ps. 88:5[4]). Those whom Yahweh has rescued from death say that they were in the "belly of Sheol" (Jon. 2:3[2]), that the "cords of Sheol" (Ps. 18:6[5]) or of death (18:5[4]; 116:3) entangled them. They thank Yahweh for having led them out or rescued them from Sheol (30:4[3]; 49:16[15]; 86:13; Hos. 13:14) or from the Pit (Job 33:28; Ps. 103:4; Jon. 2:7[6]).

The understanding of an underworld surrounded by water provided the opportunity to speak vividly of underworld distress, i.e., of mortal danger, using aquatic metaphors, as is especially the case in Jon. 2:3-10(2-9). The petitioner's stay in the "belly of Sheol" is described exclusively with metaphors of aquatic distress. Ps. 88 speaks on the one hand of the underworld, and on the other (v. 8[7]) of the waves threatening to overwhelm the petitioner.

A hopeless situation emerges when the poet of the book of Job has Job say, "Sheol is my house, I spread my couch in darkness" (17:13). Because a living person is speaking these words, they cannot refer to the underworld as the abode of the deceased. It is rather a case of metaphorical language, as is no less the case in the previously mentioned passages from songs of lament and thanksgiving, especially with regard to statements reflecting rescue. Or one can speak of a sphere of death discernible in sickness, distress, suffering, and imprisonment (cf. Barth).

When authors speak of the underworld, they are generally referring to malign, pre-

mature death. Upon receiving news of his son Joseph's death, Jacob cries out in his pain, "I shall go down to Sheol to my son, mourning" (Gen. 37:35). When he then learns that Joseph is alive, he speaks dispassionately about his own death (45:28). Reference to the underworld corresponds to malign death, death in despair, whereas references to dying correspond to a good death, a death in the circle of one's family followed by an appropriate funeral. The negative associations attaching to the underworld are absent when reference is made to the grave.[29]

4. *Yahweh's Power over the Underworld.* Rather late, statements appear in Israel asserting that Yahweh's power extends into the underworld. The saying in the Song of Hannah (1 S. 2:6) that Yahweh "kills and brings to life; he brings down to Sheol and raises up," does not belong here, since it along with several thanksgiving psalms refer to rescue from mortal danger. Dt. 32:22 probably also does not belong here with its poetically exaggerated assertion that the fire of Yahweh's wrath "burns to the depths of Sheol." Job 26:6 and Prov. 15:11, however, clearly say that the underworld and realm of the dead stand open before God and are thus subject to him. Ps. 139:8 and Am. 9:2 both presuppose that even in Sheol, no one is out of Yahweh's grasp.[30]

V. Qumran. The texts of Qumran, especially the *Hodayoth,* contain several references to *šᵉʾôl.* Although this usage corresponds essentially to that in the psalms of lament and thanksgiving, these portrayals of the underworld tend to be exaggerated almost in a baroque fashion. 1QH 3:19 speaks about rescue from the dangers of the underworld: "for you have redeemed my soul from the Pit, and from the hell of Abaddon *(miššaḥaṯ ûmiššᵉʾôl ʾᵃḇaddôn)* you have raised me up." 1QH 3:16 mentions the opening of the gates of Sheol and Abaddon, and 3:17 the opening of the gates of Sheol. Fear is expressed in the image of the underworld in 8:28 *(yôrᵉḏê šᵉʾôl);* 9:4 (par. *mišbᵉrê māweṯ);* and 10:34. The last passage says that the petitioner's groaning penetrates through to the primal abyss *(tᵉhôm)* and is shut up in the chambers of the underworld. In 3:9 the author compares his distress with the terrible pains of a woman giving birth. 1QH 17:13 describes God's judgment in the image of fire that reaches into the deep places of the underworld (*šᵉʾôl taḥtîyâ;* this term also occurs in 4Q381 10-11,5; similarly also 4QMᵃ 8-10, I, 15; 10, II, 17; cf. Dt. 32:22). 1QpHab 8:4 cites Hab. 2:5. 4Q184 1:10 speaks about the return to *šᵉʾôl.* The petitioner in 11QPsᵃ 19:10 feels he has been sold to *šᵉʾôl* because of his sin *(wʿwwnwty lšʾwl mkrwny).* The statements in 1QH 6:17; 5Q16 1, 4 are contextually unclear.

Wächter

29. → קבר *qeḇer* II.VI.
30. See Tropper, 345.

שָׁאַל *šā'al;* שְׁאֵלָה *š^e'ēlâ;* מִשְׁאָלָה *miš'ālâ;* שָׁאוּל *šā'ûl*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Cognates: 1. Egyptian; 2. Old South Arabic; 3. Akkadian; 4. Old Aramaic. III. OT: 1. Occurrences: a. Verb; b. Nouns; 2. Peculiarities, Synonyms; 3. Daily Life; 4. Theological Use; 5. Substantival Constructions; 6. Personal Names. IV. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX.

I. Etymology. The root *š'l* is attested in most of the Semitic languages. Old South Arabic attests *s'l,* "ask for, call account to, beg," with the deverbatives *s'l(m),* "request, claim, obligation," and *ms'lm* and *ms'lhw,* "place of requests."[1] The Arabic vbs. *sa'ala,* "question, inquire," *'as'ala su'lahū,* "fulfill (a wish)," and *tasa''ala* and *tasawwala,* "beg," are followed by the substantival constructions *su'l, su'la, su'āl,* "inquiry, question, request"; cf. *mas'ala* and *musā'ala,* "interrogation, hearing," and *sā'il,* "petitioner, beggar."[2] In Ethiopic one finds *sa'ala,* "ask, request," with the substantive derivatives *sĕ'ĕlat,* "question, petition," *sa'lālī,* "worshiper, petitioner," *mĕs'āl,* "oratorium," and *mas'ĕl,* "consultor";[3] cf. Tigr. *tĕsa'ala.*[4] One also encounters Akk. *šālu* I *(ša'ālu),* "question, interrogate, ask, inquire," with a plethora of derivatives, e.g., *šaltu, ša'il(t)u, šitūltu, maš'al(t)u,*[5] Ugar. *š'l* in the general sense of "asking" and specifically "receive, get,"[6] Old Aram. (and related dialects) *š'l* with substantival constructions,[7] and Pun. *yslym, ystyalm,* and *ussilim.*[8]

šā'al. Y. Amit, "*Hû' šā'ûl l^eyhwh:* Unifying Allusion — Some Methods of Literary Editing," *BethM* 27 (1981/82) 238-43; L. Díez-Merino, "Il vocabolario relativo alla ricerca di Dio nell'AT. La radice *š'l,*" *BeO* 24 (1982) 207-18; O. García de la Fuente, *La búsqueda de Dios en el AT* (Madrid, 1971); G. Gerleman, "שׁאל *š'l* to ask, request," *TLOT,* III, 1282-84; Y. Gil, "The Story of Eli and Samuel in the Book of Samuel," *BethM* 33 (1987/88) 72-78; J. J. Glassner, "Narām Sîn poliorcète. Les avatars d'une sentence divinatoire," *RA* 77 (1983) 3-10; J. Lindblom, "Lot-Casting in the OT," *VT* 12 (1962) 164-78; B. O. Long, "Historical Narrative and the Fictionalizing Imagination," *VT* 35 (1985) 405-16; H. Madl, "Die Gottesbefragung mit dem Verb *ša'al,*" *Bausteine biblischer Theologie. FS G. J. Botterweck. BBB* 50 (1977), 37-70; R. Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes. FThSt* 92 (1973), esp. 37-41, 78-79; W. H. Schmidt, "'Suchet den Herrn, so werdet ihr leben.' Exegetische Notizen zum Thema 'Gott suchen' in der Prophetie," *Ex orbe religionum. FS G. Widengren. Studies in the History of Religions/Numen Sup* 21-22 (Leiden, 1972), 127-40; G. Turbessi, "Quaerere deum. Il tema della 'ricerca di Dio' nella S. Scrittura," *RivB* 10 (1962) 282-96; M. Weippert, "Zum Präskript der hebräischen Briefe von Arad," *VT* 25 (1975) 202-12; C. Westermann, "Die Begriffe für Fragen und Suchen im AT," *KuD* 6 (1960) 2-30 = *Forschung am AT. ThB* 55 (1974), 162-90; D. J. Wiseman, "'Is it Peace?' — Covenant and Diplomacy," *VT* 32 (1982) 311-26, esp. 317-20; S. Zalevsky, "Hannah's Vow and Its Fulfillment (1 Sam 1)," *BethM* 23 (1977/78) 304-26.

1. Biella, 321-22; cf. Jamme 721.4.9-10; 877.6; ContiRossini, 192; Beeston, 121.
2. Wehr, 391; Lane, I/4, 1283-84.
3. *LexLingAeth,* 375-76.
4. *WbTigr,* 190.
5. *AHw,* III, 1151-52; *CAD,* XVII, 274-82.
6. *WUS,* no. 2566; *UT,* no. 2369; Whitaker, 581-82.
7. *DNSI,* II, 1095-96.
8. Poenulus 931, 939, 949; cf. *DNSI,* II, 1095-96.

Given the widespread distribution of this root, its relative infrequency in Canaanite is especially striking. Since Hebrew itself actually attests very few early witnesses, the suspicion arises that *šā'al* came into Hebrew by way of Aramaic.

In all the attested languages, the root *š'l* represents the two related semantic syndromes of "ask" and "request," suggesting a basic meaning bringing the two meanings together, namely, "demand,"[9] or "appeal to someone, seek something"[10] (Eng. "ask," French *demander*, Lat. *rogare*). This contributes little to the etymology of Sem. *š'l*. The root *š'l* presumably represents a primary word with appellative character. Using *š'l*, a speaker gets the attention of a counterpart in order to enter into dialogue with that counterpart, albeit a dialogue whose goal and purpose are not fixed by *š'l*. That is, in a language event *š'l* designates the illocutionary aspect of a speech act.

II. Cognates.

1. *Egyptian.* The Semitic root *š'l* is not attested in Egyptian. Alongside *śpr*, "turn to someone," and *śwnwn*, "request" (New Egyptian), the semantic equivalent is probably *nḏ*, a verb with a similar semantic spectrum, including generally "ask someone something, ascertain, interrogate someone (specifically: interrogate in a legal context, hearing)"; in the expression *nḏw.t rȝ*, "ask for advice"; *nḏ hr.t*, "ask how a person is doing, greet," with *m*, "bestow a gift upon," whence the subst. *nḏ.t ḥr*, "gift"; at the beginning of hymns often *'inḏ ḥr*, "greetings to thee."

2. *Old South Arabic.* The root *s'l* occurs in various contexts in Old South Arabic, including in the sense of "demand, make a claim": (They transferred to the deity) "this statue, which it had demanded *(ḏs'lhw)* in its revelation"; "let no one lay claim" *('l s'l)* to this grave" (cf. elsewhere: ". . . to this palm grove"); then substantivally *s'l(m)* and *s'wlt(n)*, "claim, demand."[11] It is also used with the meaning "call to account."[12] The root *s'l* is frequently attested in connection with oracular inquiry: (may god grant him) "the oracular answer he has requested *(ms'l yst'ln b'mhw)*"; whence also subst. *ms'lm* and *ms'lhw*, "place of inquiry > oracle > oracular answer."[13]

3. *Akkadian.* The Akkadian term *šâlu(m)* I *(ša'ālu)* covers a broad and varied semantic field. It means "ask someone something" in the most varied situations of daily life, including education and schools ("examine") and commerce ("agree on prices or contractual conditions"), but also refers to interrogation in official proceedings before the king or his officials, specifically in legal disputes, where it refers to a hearing before judges (also in the form *šitūlu*) or during a trial by ordeal.[14] In these and similar

9. Westermann, 9.
10. Gerleman, 1282.
11. Jamme 721.4; *CIH*, 318.4; 570.7; *RES*, 4815.4; *CIH*, 609.5.
12. *RES*, 3902b.130.3; 3951.2.
13. *CIH*, 76.5-6; 80.3; 397.5-6; Jamme 551; cf. Jamme 626.5; *CIH*, 80.11.
14. *Tablettes Cappodociennes*, 3.60.4; *Cuneiform Texts from Cappadocian Tablets* (London), 2,13,14, etc.; trial by ordeal: W. von Soden, "Gibt es ein Zeugnis dafür, dass die Babylonier an die Wiederauferstehung Marduks geglaubt haben?" *ZA* 51 (1955) 132, 7.

contexts *šâlu* can take on the meaning "call to account, make accountable," e.g., as "I make you responsible for every ship that is lost."[15] In military contexts *šâlu* refers to reconnoitering or scouting, e.g., with regard to a city's fortifications or to the intentions or strength of an enemy or the whereabouts of refugees. Such inquiry can also derive from scientific interest, in which case it means "carefully examine, research," e.g., with regard to a state's living conditions. In personal encounters or as a salutation in letters, *šâlu,* generally together with *šulmu,* expresses an inquiry regarding the welfare of the partner, i.e., a greeting; as a formula of greeting, it occurs frequently in letters as *(PN) šulum ša (PN #2) (aḫīšu) i-ša-al.*[16] In connection with *di'atu,* a mere query concerning how a person is doing turns into active concern: "(I heard that) no one cares about you. I certainly will always care about you,"[17] or, conversely, lack of concern: "you cared for me no more than for a dog."[18]

A second semantic field involves requests. Here too one encounters the most varied contexts. Someone requests the necessities (of life), a gift or present, a daughter; someone requests that a father consent to marriage;[19] or someone requests permission to do something, e.g., to take a journey or sell an ox, in both cases failing to get permission from the king or Shamash; cf. "we will open the warehouse without your consent."[20]

In religious contexts, and in contrast to Heb. *šā'al,* Akk. *šâlu* is used only in connection with querying oracles. Someone asks ecstatic men and women for signs or the great gods for (positive) oracular responses; generally the context involves war oracles, which as a rule are delivered by an oracle priest.[21]

4. *Old Aramaic.* The root *š'l* is attested several times in 8th/5th-century Old Aramaic texts. In one 5th-century Elephantine text,[22] presumably a fragmentary court protocol, *š'l*[23] refers to a court hearing, an interrogation. Another text probably refers to a private matter and its resolution through the interrogation of witnesses (Assyria, 7th century).[24] In yet another, *š'l* appears as a royal petition granted by the gods (Zinjirli, 8th century): "whatever I seize with (my) hands, (it succeeds), whatever I ask (from) my gods, they grant to me."[25]

---

15. *Altbabylonische Briefe* (Leiden), 9,241,16.

16. *University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology and Semitic Philology* (Berkeley), 9,76, no. 95,2, et passim.

17. *The Old Babylonian Tablets from Tell al Rimah* (London, 1976), 58,6ff.; cf. *ARM,* X, 46 r.9, 156, 18.

18.*Altbabylonische Briefe* (Leiden), 5,160 r.6; cf. *Tabulae Cuneiformes a F. M. Th. de Liagre Bohl collectae* (Leiden), 4,88,22.

19. W. H. P. Römer, "Studien zu altbabylonischen hymnisch-epischen Texten II," *JAOS* 86 (1966) 138, II, 9, here said of a goddess.

20. *TCL,* 19, 60,4,6; *CT,* 4,27b,4; *Sumer* 14, 63; 37, 16.

21. *ARM,* X, 4,6; O. R. Gurney, "The Sultantepe Tablets IV: The Cuthaean Legend of Naram-Sin," *AnSt* 5 (1955) 102,75.

22. *KAI* 271.

23. Ahiqar 4, 6.

24. *KAI* 233.12.

25. *KAI* 214.4.

III. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* a. *Verb.* The vb. *šā'al* occurs 171 times in the OT,[26] including 164 occurrences in the qal (13 in Genesis; 6 in Exodus; 1 in Numbers [27:21]; 8 in Deuteronomy; 5 in Joshua; 14 in Judges; 26 in 1 Samuel; 10 in 2 Samuel; 15 in 1 Kings; 6 in 2 Kings; 7 in Isaiah; 11 in Jeremiah; 1 each in Ezekiel [21:26(Eng. 21)], Hosea [4:12], Jonah [4:8], Micah [7:3], Haggai [2:11], Zechariah [10:1]; 9 in the Psalms; 7 in Job; 2 in Proverbs [20:4 *Q;* 30:7]; 2 in Ecclesiastes; 1 each in Lamentations [4:4], Ezra [8:22], Nehemiah [1:2]; 5 in 1 Chronicles [18:10 *Q*]; 6 in 2 Chronicles); then 5 times in the niphal (1 S. 20:6[bis],28[bis]; Neh. 13:6); 2 times in the piel (2 S. 20:18; Ps. 109:10); and finally 2 times in the hiphil (Ex. 12:36; 1 S. 1:28).

b. *Nouns.* Two verbal abstractions derive from the verbal root: *šᵉ'ēlâ* (1 S. 1:17, contracted to *šēlâ*), 14 times, including 1 in Judges (8:24), 2 in 1 Samuel, 2 in 1 Kings, 1 each in the Psalms (106:15) and Job (6:8), 6 in Esther; and *miš'ālâ,* 2 times, Ps. 20:6(5); 37:4 (both pl.). The term *šᵉ'ālâ* in Isa. 7:11 belongs to → שׁאול *šᵉ'ôl.*[27] According to rabbinical tradition, this term represents a secondary form of *šᵉ'ēlâ;* cf. Sam. *šīyāla.*

2. *Peculiarities, Synonyms.* As a *verbum dicendi* and generally amplified by *lē'mōr* (Gen. 37:15; Ex. 13:14; Jgs. 20:23; 1 S. 23:2; 30:8; 2 S. 2:1; 5:19; 1 Ch. 14:10; Jer. 36:17) or a finite form of the vb. *'āmar* (e.g., Gen. 24:47; 32:30[29]; 1 S. 19:22), *šā'al* introduces a direct or indirect question. In such cases the person addressed is generally the direct object (Gen. 24:47; 38:21; 2 S. 14:18), while the object of inquiry is introduced with *lᵉ* (Gen. 32:30[29]; Dt. 4:32; Jgs. 13:18; 2 K. 8:6; Job 8:8; Jer. 6:16), standing rarely as an indirect object (e.g., Isa. 58:2; Jer. 50:5). In straightforward declarative statements, the object of inquiry is usually the direct object (e.g., Jgs. 5:25; 1 S. 8:10; 2 K. 4:3), occasionally with *'al* (Neh. 1:2; Eccl. 7:10; Isa. 45:11) with an accompanying weakening of the cognitive aspect and a semantic shift toward "ask about, inquire, be concerned about."

Fixed expressions include *šā'al bᵉ* + DN or *lᵉ* + DN in the connection with querying an oracle,[28] *šā'al (lᵉ-)šālôm,*[29] and *šā'al 'eṯ-napšô lāmûṯ* (1 K. 19:4; Jon. 4:8).[30]

Synonyms found in the narrower and broader context include → דרשׁ *dāraš* (Dt. 13:15[14]; 1 Ch. 10:13; Isa. 65:1); → בקשׁ *biqqēš* (2 S. 20:18-19; cf. Est. 5:6,7,8; 7:2,3; 9:12); and → חקר *ḥāqar* (Dt. 13:15[14]).

3. *Daily Life.* The term *šā'al* refers to the questioning from which both biblical and modern human beings live. Questioning is one of the most primal and vital activities in which people engage. Through questions, people tentatively, searchingly come into

---

26. Lisowsky, 1391-92; also Gerleman, 1282; *HAL,* IV, 1372a.

27. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 285; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1983), 151 n. 4.

28. See 4.a below.

29. See 3.b below.

30. See 3.c below.

contact with their surroundings (cf. in this semantic element the synonymous character of → דרשׁ dāraš). By asking, learning, and understanding in a stepwise fashion (cf. in this regard the existential aspect of → ידע yāḏa'), people come to understand themselves as distinctive members of a community that even in its smallest organizational unit, the family, is in its own turn part of more comprehensive communities. The activity of questioning is rooted in the community in which it is engaged[31] and is part of a unified process that creates community through participation and reciprocation of the sort actualized in the process of question and answer. The term *šā'al* never aims at mere information,[32] but rather at a person's due participation in the life community, participation that the questioner is demanding and that the respondent either grants or denies. It is from this situation that the two primary meanings of *šā'al* emerge and can be explained, namely, asking and requesting.

a. *Asking.* The character of *šā'al* as an act that creates and maintains community is especially clear in what is known as the children's question, e.g., in Dt. 6:20-21: "When your children ask you in time to come, 'What is the meaning of the decrees and the statutes and the ordinances that Yahweh our God has commanded you?' then you shall say to your children. . . ." Its setting in life is the transmission of clan ethos in the instruction of children by the paterfamilias. Israel's Yahweh faith led to a new form of social life that the Dtn law guards and preserves. This liberating significance of the law is disclosed ever anew to succeeding generations when parents tell about their own experiences with God and profess their faith in the people's salvation history; cf. Ex. 13:14 with regard to Passover and firstlings regulations, and Josh. 4:6 (Dtr) with regard to the memorial stone in the Jordan (v. 21 is a later addendum).

The term *šā'al* is also used in quite varied domestic and interpersonal situations. In Gen. 37:15 a stranger helps Joseph, who is wandering around in search of his brothers, by showing him the way. In 40:7 Joseph in his own turn shows solidarity with Pharaoh's imprisoned officials. His concerned questioning sets the following events in motion. In his thorough inquiry concerning his father and youngest brother (43:7; 44:19), Joseph shows his unbroken feeling of still belonging to his family and makes it possible for them to be brought together. Through great extravagance, Jacob tries to get Esau's attention and arouse sympathy in him (32:18[17]) in order to overcome their quarrels. An inquiry concerning consent and its announcement are the beginning of a happy marriage between Rebekah and Isaac (24:47,57). On the other hand, Isaac's false answer when asked about his family relationships by the people of Gerar endangers not only his marriage but also the life of the villagers (26:7).[33] The establishment of David's loyal behavior is intended to move Nabal to provide food for his retinue (1 S. 25:8).

The term *šā'al* is used in a specialized sense in the legal and sacral-legal sphere. The Dtn law, particularly the legal collection in Dt. 12–26, presupposes several cases re-

---

31. See Westermann, 10.

32. A different view is taken by Gerleman, 1282-83.

33. On this "deliberate adaptation" (so C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* [Eng. trans. 1985], 425), see R. Martin-Achard, "Remarques sur Genèse 26," *ZAW* 100 Sup (1988) 22-46.

quiring thorough investigation on the basis of extant laws. Dt. 13:15 addresses the problem of being led astray from the Yahweh faith. Here *šā'al* is used together with *dāraš* and *ḥāqar.* The reference is probably to official proceedings.[34] The exactitude of the investigation is indicated by the postpositive hiphil abs. inf. *hêṭēḇ*. The petitioner of Ps. 35 is involved in a trial, having been confronted with false accusation by his adversaries in a hearing before judges (v. 11). 2 K. 8:1-6 addresses the problem of inheritance in a proceeding before the king as the last line of appeal. After careful examination (v. 6), he orders the return of the property to the Shunammite woman as well as compensation for lost revenue. In 2 S. 14:1-24 the woman of Tekoa presents David with a fictitious case for examination (v. 18) and adjudication at Joab's behest in order to prepare the reconciliation with Absalom.[35] In Jer. 36:17 and 38:27, royal officials interrogate Baruch and Jeremiah in preparation for proceedings against the prophet. The post-Jeremianic oracle against Israel's stubbornness and refusal to repent in 18:11-17 (the reproach in vv. 13-15a with the announcement of judgment in vv. 15b-17 follow the Dtr statement in vv. 11-12) issues the summons to question the nations as witnesses to determine whether they have "heard the like of this" (v. 13).

Occasionally *šā'al* is used in connection with war. David's victory over the Philistines so impresses Saul that he orders an inquiry in order to get David to come to him (1 S. 17:56). When Saul later becomes his bitter enemy, he pursues David when the latter flees and tries to find out his whereabouts in order to eliminate him (19:22). Sisera hopes to escape Barak's inquiries by fleeing into Jael's tent but instead leaps from the frying pan into the fire (Jgs. 4:20).[36] Gideon forces the names of the officials and elders of Succoth from a young man (Jgs. 8:14). The prophecy in Jer. 48 anticipates the military catastrophe of Moab. In the lament of 48:14-20, the inhabitants of remote Aroer learn of Moab's fall from passing refugees from Dibon (v. 19). By taking the initiative to meet with them, Nehemiah announces his own personal concern with the fate of the Jews who were rescued from the catastrophe (Neh. 1:2).

To the extent wisdom questioning is expressed by *šā'al,* it aims at investigating individual phenomena and examining the regular course of events with an eye on coming to understand the whole, on illuminating the meaning of life from the perspective of its boundaries as well as of its daily occurrences. This process presupposes the acquisition of wisdom through a thorough study of traditional knowledge and rules of life as well as through examining one's own experiences. Those who do not adequately prepare for a "rich harvest" by properly preparing their fields in this sense, and yet still hope for a rich yield *(šā'al),* are merely fools (Prov. 20:4). The wise come to a basic understanding of the inseparable connection between act-consequence and behavior-fate, a connection pointing to and ultimately grounded in God's compensatory righteousness. This principle should provide one's orientation for understanding and engaging in hu-

---

34. Cf. Díez-Merino, 211; F. Horst, *Gottes Recht. ThB* 12 (1961), 38.

35. Cf. E. Bellefontaine, "Customary Law and Chieftainship: Judicial Aspects of 2 Samuel 14:4-21," *JSOT* 38 (1987) 47-72.

36. Cf. Y. Amit, "Judges 4: Its Content and Form," *JSOT* 39 (1987) 89-111; H.-D. Neef, "Der Sieg Deboras und Baraks über Sisera," *ZAW* 101 (1989) 28-49.

man life, since this principle has already proven itself both in the experience of the wise and in an examination of the teachings and life rules of all earlier wisdom teachers, at least according to the understanding of Bildad (Job 8:8). Job counters that anyone who has gotten around a bit in the world can see the discrepancy attaching to this principle, particularly in the fate of the tyrant, whose signs of power, fame, and wealth are visible everywhere (21:29). According to Eccl. 7:8-10, however, the questionable character of wisdom principles and the resulting contradictory behavior of wisdom teachers can already be seen on a smaller scale. Verses 8-9 cite a central teaching of the ancient Near Eastern wisdom tradition that v. 10 then counters with its contrasting experience. That is, wisdom questioning and understanding are circular. The fiction of the king in Eccl. 1:12–3:15 examines wisdom as a whole, concluding that it is highly questionable whether such rich participation in wisdom (2:10, *šā'al* with a strongly emotional element in the sense of demand, desire) genuinely represents enduring gain for a person. Hence the searching and questioning of the wise in Prov. 30:1-14 turn in 30:7-9 (formally a numerical saying) into a request directed to God without mentioning him by name. Because all wisdom does not lead to an understanding of God, the wise person asks (v. 7) for the prerequisites for a God-fearing life (vv. 8-9), a life that according to Job 12:7-12 is based on an understanding of the creaturely character of all things. This equally simple and basic insight needs no mediation through wisdom teaching, being rather accessible to everyone (v. 7), since God, the Creator of all things, has given it to every human being.

In the exposition of what is known as the Song of Moses in Dt. 32:1-7, introduced by the call of the instructor and composed in the style of wisdom instruction, v. 7 connects the children's question from the tradition of clan ethos with wisdom questions. The examination of the course of history and a recollection of salvation history itself converge in the confession "the Rock, his work is perfect, and all his ways are just" (v. 4). Within a horizon expanded to the very limits of time and space, Dt. 4:32 summons Israel to a religio-historical comparison so that they might understand the unique character of the salvific events in which they have been involved.

In the reproach of Jer. 6:16,17,20, prophecy borrows the wisdom notion of choosing the correct path and charges Israel itself to choose ("ask for," *šā'al*) these "ancient paths" that experience has shown to lead to the good. These paths are indeed known to Israel, and it need only reflect on them. The post-Jeremianic oracle of salvation in Jer. 30:5-7 summons the community to reflect on an obvious experience from daily life (v. 6: a man bearing a child) in order to see the absurdity of their own present behavior in view of the evidence of imminent salvation.

b. *šā'al (lᵉ)šālôm.* In connection with a greeting, the formulaic expression *šā'al lᵉšālôm* inquires how a person is doing. Whereas the greeting asks directly about the *šālôm,* in the inquiry this occurs indirectly. Such a query aims at establishing community. Unlike a greeting, an inquiry regarding a person's welfare is never merely noncommittal, always expressing rather a person's sincere concern for the life and fate of the person addressed. In Gen. 43:27 Joseph expresses such concern regarding his brothers. In this context one should note the undertones that the narrator allows to resonate by using this formula. The brothers see in their counterpart a powerful lord. By us-

ing this query, Joseph in fact paves the way for reconciliation with his brothers and for a reunification of the family. In Ex. 18:7 mutual inquiry concerning the *šālôm* ends a phase of burdened relationships between Moses and Jethro. In 2 S. 11:7 David inquires regarding the *šālôm* of Joab, the people, and the war, but not regarding that of Uriah, who is standing before him, indicating that the relationship has been broken and anticipating the coming catastrophe.

In the form *š'l* + DN + *lšlm,* this expression functions as a formula of greeting in the prescript of several Hebrew letters from Arad, for example: *'l 'dny 'lyšb yhwh yš'l lšlmk,* "to Eliashib. May Yahweh see to your welfare."[37] The formula is attested in a similar form in Aramaic papyri and ostraca from Egypt.[38]

This formula also seems to have been used, as in Akkadian,[39] in language of diplomacy as an expression of the peaceful regulating of contractual and extracontractual relations. In 1 S. 10:4 three young pilgrims on their way to Bethel ask Saul, whom Samuel has just anointed king, about his *šālôm.* Since at the same time they offer and Saul accepts two of the loaves they have brought as sacrificial gifts, the whole event constitutes an act of formal recognition of the new king's position and authority.[40]

This formula does not necessarily, however, establish a relationship of subordination. In 1 S. 25:5 David sends ten of his best warriors to Nabal with the instructions: *ûše'eltem-lô bišmî lešālôm.* The message, introduced by the blessing over the entire household, follows. The emissaries expect a positive response in the form of a corresponding gift. It seems as if David wants to regulate contractually a protection guarantee and protection money with Nabal, though Nabal brusquely rejects this attempt with the formulaic "Who is David?" (v. 10), leading to the brink of war (v. 13), which Abigail, Nabal's wife, is able to avert through clever negotiations. In 2 S. 8:10 = 1 Ch. 18:10, the king of Hamath sends his son to David with gifts after David's victory over Hadadezer (gifts recalling Jehu's tribute to Shalmaneser II), with the instructions: *liš'ol-lô lešālôm ûlebāreḵô.* The purpose of the legation is probably to make preparations for the conclusion of the vassal treaty, not to conclude the treaty itself. When after defeating the Amalekites David presents *šālôm* to the warriors who stayed behind with the baggage (1 S. 30:21), he thereby indicates their equal status with the warriors who actually fought in the battle, and does so in the form of a universally valid ordinance. In 1 S. 17:22 the young David brings provisions to his brothers, who are fighting with Saul against the Philistines, *wayyiš'al le'eḥāyw lešālôm.* The formulation is consciously ambiguous. David is not only asking about the welfare of his biological brothers, but he is also offering to aid the brothers of his people in battle, aid that proves itself in the victory over the Philistines; here David announces in a reserved but emphatic fashion his claim to leadership.

---

37. *IDAM,* 67-669 (6th century); similarly also *IDAM,* 67-990 (early 6th century), whose text is not completely clear; concerning its reconstruction, cf. Weippert, 211.

38. *AP* 30.1-2; 56.1, et passim.

39. See II.3 above.

40. So already K. Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel. KHC* VIII (1902), 66; cf. M. Tsevat, "Studies in the Book of Samuel," *HUCA* 33 (1962) 117; Wiseman, 318; a position of strict rejection is taken by H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 206.

The oracle about the end of Jerusalem in Jer. 15:5-9, which is simultaneously a lament, a portrayal of distress, and a threat, opens with the painful question regarding just who, if anyone, will *liš'ōl lᵉšālōm lāḵ* (v. 5). Israel has rejected Yahweh and broken his covenant (v. 6). In the coming judgment Israel will have no allies. The petitioner of Ps. 122:6 cries out from this painful experience in view of the rebuilt city and temple and summons all pilgrims and inhabitants to pray incessantly on behalf of themselves and the city for the *šālôm* that Yahweh has granted anew.

c. *Requests.* In contrast to *pll* hithpael, *šā'al* as a *verbum petendi* is always used transitively, never referring to a petition or plea from within distress, but rather to a request for something. This particular semantic field is quite varied. First there are the various kinds of requests or petitions. The distressed request comes to expression in Jgs. 5:25, where the fleeing Sisera asks for water. Children as the weakest members of (ancient) society have to beg for the necessities of life (Ps. 109:10 piel; Lam. 4:4). The request comes to expression as a wish in 2 K. 2:9, where before his death Elijah offers to fulfill a wish for Elisha. By asking for two-thirds of the spirit of his master (according to Dt. 21:17, this portion goes to the firstborn), he is saying he wants to be the main heir and successor of Elijah. The request takes the form of a favor in 1 K. 2:13-22. The queen mother has the right to present a request to the king at any time. Bathsheba makes use of this privilege on behalf of Adonijah. The accumulation of this verb (5 times in vv. 16,20,22 alone, vv. 16 and 20 amplified with *šᵉ'ēlâ* as the inner object) shows the delicate nature of this matter. The narrator skillfully employs the nuances of the term here. It is no less delicate a matter when David, wanting to stay away from Saul's royal table, asks Jonathan for permission to be away (1 S. 20:6,28 [4 times]). In Neh. 13:6 Nehemiah requests permission to leave royal service and return to Jerusalem.

Josh. 19:50 shows the transition from request to demand. In connection with the land distribution, which according to a post-Dtr redactor was determined by sacred lots, Joshua receives the desired city. The text contains various kinds of demands, including domestic (Josh. 15:18 = Jgs. 1:14; the daughter demands a piece of land as a dowry from her father) and contractual (2 S. 3:13). Political demands, however, predominate. In Jgs. 8:24 and 26, Gideon demands that each Israelite give him a golden earring from the war spoils. This demand and compliance with it establish a ruler-subject relationship, which runs contrary to the Dtr conception of Gideon's rejection of the kingship (vv. 8,22-23). In 1 S. 8:10,12,13,17,19, the people demand and receive a king, thus acknowledging his authority and subjecting themselves to his will. Mic. 7:3 castigates the greed of royal officials, who continually demand gifts (as bribes?). The demand for songs and mirth in Ps. 137:3 represents an act of political violence toward the exiles. Finally, a demand can also derive from completely personal cravings (Dt. 14:26; cf. 2 S. 12:20).

Some passages use *šā'al* to mean "borrow." According to Ex. 22:13(14), a person must provide compensation for borrowed goods that have been damaged, which is why the apprentice prophet cries out in despair when his borrowed iron ax head falls into the Jordan (2 K. 6:5). Before performing the miracle, Elisha has the widow of one of his students borrow empty vessels from her neighbors (2 K. 4:3). The narrator in Ex. 11:2 and 12:35-36 engages the theme of "borrowing" in a unique way. The Egyptians

who agree to the request for valuables (12:36, *šā'al* hiphil) are to understand this gesture as "lending," whereas the Israelites view the loaned goods as compensation for their forced labor. Ex. 3:18 and 22 (R^P) anticipate the theme of the plundering of the Egyptians with a slight shift in accent, with *šā'al* in v. 22 relinquishing the meaning of "lend" in favor of "demand."

The expressions *šā'al napšô lāmûṯ* (1 K. 19:4; Jon. 4:8) and *šā'al bᵉ'ālâ napšô* (Job 31:30) refer to a special kind of demand. To "ask for (one's) life" was originally probably a magical formula asking that the life of one's enemy be given over to one's power through magical means so that it might be extinguished. In Job 31:30 this expression has long since lost its magical meaning and has been transformed into a demand to God in the sense of a wish that one's enemy die through a curse as divine punishment. In 1 K. 19:4 Elijah articulates this death wish with regard to his own life because he has failed in his battle with the Ba'al cult. By contrast, in Jon. 4:8 it is anger at God's merciful attitude toward the pagans and his alleged injustice toward the prophet of the novella that prompts the latter's death wish, a wish ironically patterned after 1 K. 19:4.

4. *Theological Use.* The use of *šā'al* in theological contexts corresponds precisely to its use in daily life. That is, no specifically theological use is discernible, and the semantic aspects of "ask" and "request" basically counterbalance each other.

a. *Asking God.* Encounters with the numinous are dangerous for human beings and as such prompt profound fear.[41] At the same time, however, there is a desire to comprehend the numinous, to get control of it and be able to use it. To that end, its anonymity must be overcome and its essence and intentions become open and known through the utterance of its name. Hence one of the most elementary activities in encounters with the divine is to ask about its name. Gen. 32:30(29) and Jgs. 13:6,18 preserve a reminiscence of this notion, one ultimately rooted in animism.

In the religions of civilized peoples, inquiry concerning the will and decisions of the deity in personal and public matters is the domain of institutionalized oracles, as attested throughout the ancient world. Such oracular inquiry takes place in a sanctuary and is carried out by an oracular priest. The means of such inquiry are varied, as illustrated by Ezk. 21:26(21) and Hos. 4:12. Isa. 30:2 shows that before any major national actions were undertaken in Israel, a Yahweh oracle had to be obtained, a regulation presumably largely followed. The possibility also existed for obtaining oracles in times of personal crisis, in matters of agricultural activities, or with regard to harvest prospects. Apparently the people made ample use of such oracles, the technical term for which was *šā'al.*

The activity of *šā'al bē'lōhîm* refers to querying God through a priest, one of whom was available to every Israelite in times of crisis or decision. Its most original form emerges in Jgs. 18:5-6; 1 S. 22:13,15; cf. 1 S. 22:10, where Yahweh is the interpretive means (cf. LXX). The locus of the inquiry is the hill country of Ephraim or the priestly city of Nob. In both instances the goal is to obtain an oracle indicating which path to

41. → ירא *yārē'.*

take. In Jgs. 18:5-6 the five "valiant men" of the Danites obtain an oracle in their search for a new territory to live in. In 1 S. 22:13 and 15, it is David during his flight from Saul. Although no means of inquiry are mentioned, the use of the ephod and teraphim/ ephod might be deduced contextually. The occurrences of *šā'al bē'lōhîm* (Jgs. 20:18; 1 S. 14:37; 1 Ch. 14:10; cf. 2 S. 5:19,23) are later constructions.

The setting in life of the expression *šā'al bᵉyhwh* is the Yahweh war (9 of 12 times). Inquirers include David (1 S. 23:2,4; 30:8; 2 S. 2:1; 5:19,23), Saul (1 S. 28:6), Ahimelech (1 S. 22:10), sons of Israel (Jgs. 1:1; 20:23,27); 1 S. 10:22 is unclear. In later times the Yahweh inquiry could be used to determine a place change that was of significance for salvation history and that ultimately resulted in a coronation (2 S. 2:1ff.) or could even be used for choosing the king (1 S. 10:22-23). 1 S. 30:8 contains an early narrative form of a Yahweh inquiry. It is divided into five parts:[42] inquiry *(wayyiš'al dāwiḏ bᵉyhwh lē'mōr),* question (here a double question), formulaic response *(wayyō'mer lô),* imperative command *(rᵉḏōp),* and assurance of success, which refers to David in two *figura etymologica.* The immediate context also exhibits ancient features. Verse 7 mentions the priest and the presentation of the ephod. Perhaps the priest spoke the response, as was probably also the case in 2 S. 5:23-24 (cf. Yahweh's actions in the 3rd person and the par. 1 Ch. 14:14-15). It seems that a redactor may consciously have allowed the inquiry through the priest to recede into the background. The other passages no longer mention the priest. Just how Yahweh answers remains open, as does the question regarding the actual method of inquiry. The use of ephod and teraphim can be deduced contextually from Jgs. 18:14ff.; according to 17:5, they are part of the utensils used in the house of God and were made by Micah. Only a later (Dtr?) redactor intimates that these cultic utensils might have been the subject of rejection and mockery. Hos. 3:4 and Zech. 10:2 both understand and anathematize the ephod and teraphim as originally pagan-Canaanite utensils associated with divine inquiry. The Dtr History pursues the same theological intention by repressing references to the priest and his oracular utensils within the framework of Yahweh inquiries and by simultaneously including in the assurance of success (Jgs. 1:2; 20:28; 1 S. 23:4; 2 S. 5:19) the formula of transfer whose life setting was clearly prophecy (Nu. 21:34; Dt. 1:8; 2:24,31; 3:2; Jgs. 7:2,9; cf. Josh. 8:1,18; 11:6). In this context the institution of the Yahweh inquiry adopted from history and bound to specific prerequisites becomes the historico-theological instrument of interpretation not only of the epoch of the Yahweh wars themselves, but also of the period of the land conquest and the saving judges to the extent these inquiries are completely subsumed under the revealed word of Yahweh. A redactor then adjusted the transitions in Jgs. 1:1-3 and 20:28 in this spirit.

This interpretation of history is tightly focused in the portrayal of Saul's fall and David's ascent, where *šā'al bᵉyhwh* functions as a leitmotif. The Yahweh inquiry enters a crisis during the transition from charismatic leaders to the monarchy. Saul's fall is associated with the collapse of this institution; God falls silent, and as a result Saul is in-

---

42. Cf. Madl, 51, though his method of determination and his question schemata seem rather artificial otherwise.

capable of action (1 S. 28:6; the juxtaposition of conventional means of revelation betrays the systematic thinking of a later period). Inquiring of the dead confirms God's judgment and silence (28:16). Whereas the failure of Yahweh to respond brings about the catastrophe of Saul's dynasty, David's own ascent is closely associated with successful Yahweh inquiry, though the institution does undergo a profound alteration that ultimately brings about its dissolution. 1 S. 23:6 and 13 are significant in this respect.

The question concerning various alternatives recedes before the reflexive question, which now includes a request. The Yahweh inquiry changes into a prayer for Yahweh's guidance (cf. 1 S. 30:6-9). The remark in 2 S. 16:23 marks the end of the institution; the counsel of a political adviser is now equated with a divine response.

Late forms of Yahweh inquiry include Nu. 27:15-23, which presents the installation of Joshua as Moses' successor in v. 21 as a decision of the Urim oracle obtained by Eleazar. In this basically late (post-Dtr?) piece, vv. 20-21 are secondary and are designed to construe a role for this priest in the Yahweh war that he in fact did not have. Perhaps the insertion betrays the presence of circles who were hoping for a renaissance of the monarchy and of the Yahweh wars in which cultic officials would again enjoy an important function (cf. 1 Ch. 24).

Isa. 30:2 shows the transition from inquiring through priests to obtaining a divine response through prophets. This verse, part of a justified cry of woe from the year of Hezekiah's revolt against Sennacherib (703/702), mentions an alliance with Egypt "without asking for my counsel" (lit. "mouth": *ûpî lō' šā'ālû*). Isaiah also mentions "Yahweh's mouth" in 1:20 in a concluding formula to an oracle of judgment (vv. 18-20). The reproach does not say that they did not obtain a Yahweh oracle, but that they did not pay attention to the word of Yahweh proclaimed by the prophet. Zedekiah (Jer. 37:17; 38:14), the *śārîm* (38:27), and the people, prophet, or priest (23:33, a late piece) come to Jeremiah to inquire of Yahweh's word. The question is preserved in 37:17 and 23:33, and the answer, introduced by the messenger formula, in 38:17. The alternative *hāyâ/nittan bᵉyaḏ* shows the transition from salvific oracle to announcement of judgment (vv. 17-18), with the announcement of judgment taking the form of the formula of transfer. The contextually peculiar formulation "inquire of the mouth of Yahweh" in Josh. 9:14 is probably not saying that a divine oracle was supposed to be obtained for determining the relations between the Israelites and the Gibeonites, but rather that no sacral-legal connotation attached to these relations to begin with.

The interpretation of 2 S. 20:18 is disputed. This passage mentions a *šā'al bᵉ'āḇēl* that was allegedly customary *bāri'šōnâ*. Here the remark serves to confirm the woman's statement. Perhaps the passage preserves a reminiscence of a divine inquiry in Abel of Beth-maacah.[43]

Hos. 4:12 polemicizes against certain forms of inquiry. The passage indicates Canaanite oracular practices involving agricultural practice and harvest prospects. It remains unclear whether the "wood" and "rod" refer to the cultic posts of the Asherim,

43. Cf. M. L. Geyer, "Stopping the Juggernaut: A Close Reading of 2 Samuel 20:13-22," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 41 (1986/87) 33-42.

to oracular trees that provided guidance through the rustling of their branches (2 S. 5:23-24; cf. the tree names in Gen. 12:6; Jgs. 9:37), or to rhabdomancy, an oracle with wooden bars. Dt. 18:11 and 1 Ch. 10:13 indict *šā'al 'ôḇ wᵉyiddᵉʿōnî* and *šā'al bā'ôḇ,* i.e., spirit diviners who conjure a certain dead spirit for the inquirer. Both passages use *šā'al* interchangeably with *dāraš.*

b. *When God Asks.* In relatively few instances is God the subject of *šā'al.* Here too the semantic groups "ask" (Job 38:3; 40:7; 42:4) and "request" (Dt. 10:12; Ps. 40:7[6]) emerge.

"I will question you, and you shall declare to me" (Job 38:3). God presents himself to the divine judgment demanded by Job. The metaphor of the wrestling match (a form of divine judgment common in the ancient Near East) for which Job is to prepare himself refers not to a nonbinding dispute among wisdom teachers, but rather to God's own existential questioning of a person regarding that person's faith, i.e., the person's willingness to acknowledge and confess that the meaning of the divine plan remains inaccessible to human knowledge. This challenge, which alludes to 13:22, views all human self-confidence and self-assuredness with irony.[44]

Dt. 10:12-13 articulates the consequences of covenant breach and renewal, describing a comprehensive attitude of fear of Yahweh, i.e., of worship toward the covenantal God of Horeb. Israel's loyal relationship with Yahweh is accentuated as an exclusive contractual relationship (*šā'al* suggests the contractual obligation). Israel's own worship is above all also service to fellow human beings according to the Dtn social regulations. Ps. 40:7 and 9(6,8) follow the same theological line in similarly referring *šā'al* to the *tôrâ,* which "is written in the scroll of the book," i.e., concretely to the Dtn law.

c. *Requests.* As in the secular sphere, a request directed to God with *šā'al* is always a request for something, though concerns vary. In 1 Ch. 4:10 Jabez requests God's blessing and helping hand, and also freedom from misfortune and worry. In Zech. 10:1 the community issues the summons to ask Yahweh, the Lord of creation, for rain "in the season of the spring rain," instead of trusting in teraphim and diviners. In Ps. 27:4 the persecuted petitioner turns in trust to Yahweh in an hour of need with a request for God's salvific favor, which he is apparently expecting in the form of a divine oracle in the temple. The confidence in bringing one's concerns to Yahweh is grounded in personal experience and above all in salvation history itself, which repeatedly shows that Yahweh does hear and fulfill the requests of his people (Ps. 105:40; cf. Dt. 18:16). Ps. 78:18, however, warns against exploiting God's goodness and favor and against testing it through exaggerated, greedy wishes, which this historical psalm suggests was the sin of the ancestors and the reason they failed.

The history of the beginnings of the monarchy is inseparably associated with the childhood history of Samuel (1 S. 1:1–2:11a) and is structured according to the key word *šā'al,* with the narrator skillfully operating with the semantic nuances attaching

---

44. For further discussion see H.-P. Müller, "Gottes Antwort an Ijob und das Recht religiöser Wahrheit," *BZ* 32 (1988) 210-31; on the secondary character of the two other passages, cf. G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1952), 94-98; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 494, 532.

to the word (cf. 1:17 [with the verbal noun as inner object]; 20:27[cf. v. 17],28 [with the change from hiphil to the qal pass. ptcp.]). This narrative device accentuates the special relationship of service and trust into which Yahweh has brought Samuel. At the same time, it serves as the paradigm for the future king, whom Samuel will give to the people at their request. According to 2:20, fulfillment of the *še'ēlâ 'ašer šā'al yhwh* (MT corrected; *leyhwh* was appropriated from 1:28) will bring the parents wonderful blessing, underscoring yet again and in a different fashion the significance and importance of Samuel's service.

One of the privileges of the chosen and enthroned king was probably the right to request favors, favors whose fulfillment God assures. In 1 K. 3:2-15 (cf. 2 Ch. 1:3-13), Solomon receives such assurance in a revelatory dream in Gibeon in a portrayal bearing features of the Egyptian "royal novella." Here too *šā'al* functions as a key word (3:5,10,11,13). Because Solomon has requested what is appropriate, as a bonus he is also granted what he did not request. Concerning the promise and granting of the royal request, cf. also Ps. 2:8 (direct speech) and 21:5(4) (narrative praise). In Isa. 7:11-12 such a request appears in prophetic garb as the granting of a sign of confirmation with regard to promises. The prophet confronts the king directly with "his God," a formulation recalling the Judean royal tradition (cf. Ps. 2:7). The "son" may and — summoned by God — indeed must request a sign; refusal to do so constitutes a termination of that sonship.

Late prophetic proclamation also uses *šā'al.* In Isa. 45:9-13, a textually difficult disputation oracle, Yahweh rejects the exiles' charge that through his judgment he has in fact acted unjustly by showing himself in the eyes of the other nations to be inferior to their gods. The reproach in Isa. 65:1ff. contrasts God's own offer of grace and personal favor to the behavior of the postexilic community, which while complaining about God's distance and lack of assurances (e.g., 64:11[12]) nonetheless does not "ask about me" (65:1), i.e., does not remain faithful to the covenant (par. "does not seek" [*biqqēš*] and "does not call on my name" [*qārā'*]). Within the context of the admonition in 58:1-2, *šā'al mišpeṭê-ṣeḏeq* (v. 2b) parallels *dāraš yhwh* and *ḥāpēṣ da'aṯ derāḵay* in reference to the desire for guidance in worship. In the promise of the new covenant in Jer. 50:4-7, "to ask the way to Zion" (v. 5; in v. 4b par. to *biqqēš yhwh*) means to commit oneself firmly to Zion as the locus of Yahweh's covenantal presence.

5. *Substantival Constructions.* a. The verbal noun *še'ēlâ* refers exclusively to requests, albeit with various nuances. In 1 S. 1:17 (cf. v. 27), Hannah is assured that her most ardent wish, namely, to have a child, will be fulfilled (*še'ālṯēḵ 'ašer šā'alt* [cf. *BHS*]; paronomasia in the relative clause). 1 S. 2:20 uses the same expression to articulate Yahweh's unconditional demand that Samuel become his trusted servant. Jgs. 8:24 uses *še'ēlâ* as an inner object in reference to Gideon's contractual demand. Ps. 106:15 reproaches the greedy wishes with which the people put Yahweh to the test in the wilderness, wishes he nonetheless fulfilled *(nāṯan).* In 1 K. 2:16-17 Adonijah presents to Bathsheba as his "one request" to have Abishag as his wife; Bathsheba then presents it to the king as an official request from the queen mother. The significance of this request is not affected by its designation as "one small request" (v. 20).

In six passages in Esther *še'ēlâ* parallels *baqqāšâ*. In 5:6 and 7:2 (cf. 9:12), the king introduces the possibility of a request by asking about Esther's concern and assuring its fulfillment, adding the formula of confirmation "even to the half of my kingdom." This scene presumably refers to the customary granting of a request at royal meals at the Persian court (7:1 specifically mentions a banquet), a custom already reported by Herodotus.[45]

b. "May Yahweh fulfill all your *miš'alôṯ*" (Ps. 20:6[5]). This wish, spoken for the enthroned king within the framework of a cultic act, probably refers first of all to the request Yahweh grants as a favor and then fulfills for the new king, though it doubtless also is to be understood as a more general, formulaic wish for good fortune and blessing. The sapiential instructional poem Ps. 37 tries to provide direction and guidance to the passionate questioning concerning God's presence and dominion in the world in view of the obvious triumph of the wicked and their wrongdoing. The wisdom teacher advises avoiding all discord and bitterness toward Yahweh and instead to rejoice in Yahweh and to do good oneself; then he will fulfill *(nāṯan)* the *miš'alôṯ*, the desire for meaning and clarity and for opportunities and happiness.

6. *Personal Names.* The root *š'l* is a constituent part of several personal and place names. The name *šā'ûl,* occurring about 400 times,[46] probably does not mean "lent (to Yahweh)" (cf. "one who is loaned from Yahweh" or "loaned from Yahweh"),[47] but rather "the requested one, the one begged for,"[48] or in view of 1 S. 1:28, "I make him into one who is requested by Yahweh," i.e., "I give, consecrate him to Yahweh."[49] The name *š'l* is attested in extrabiblical witnesses.[50] It could be read as *še'āl* after Ezra 10:29, or with an eye on popular etymology *še'altî'ēl* (after Aram. *še'ilâ*), whose original form is preserved in Neo-Babylonian *Salti-ilu* (cf. the Hebrew form in Hag. 1:12,14; 2:2); Ezra 10:29 KOr reads *yiš'āl* instead. This name form is attested on a Hebrew seal.[51] More recently the name *šepanyāhû (bn) še'ilâ* was discovered on a 5th-century Hebrew seal impression.[52] The name *še'ilâ,* like *še'āl,* probably represents less the abbreviation of a theophoric verbal name than a noun meaning "wish, request." Despite the feminine form, it is a man's name; cf. Aram. *yhwḥnn br š'lh* and *nḥm bn š'lh.*[53] Cf. also *'eštā'ō(ô)l,* "place where the oracle is consulted" (Josh. 15:33; 19:41; Jgs. 13:25; 16:31; 18:2,8,11).[54]

---

45. A more cautious approach in → II, 241.
46. Gerleman, 1282.
47. Ibid., 1283, following *IPN,* 136.
48. M. Noth, "Samuel und Silo," *VT* 13 (1963) 395.
49. Westermann, "Begriffe," 14 n. 13, following *KD,* in loc.
50. *KAI* 24.4.
51. F. Vattioni, "I sigilli ebraici," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 381, no. 213.
52. N. Avigad, *Hebrew Bullae from the Time of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem, 1986), 99-100, no. 155.
53. F. M. Cross, "Samaria Papyrus 1," *ErIsr* 18 (1985) 7*-17*, esp. 8*; Y. Shiloh, "A Hoard of Hebrew Bullae from the City of David," *ErIsr* 18 (1985) 77-87 and 68*.
54. *HAL,* I, 100a.

IV. 1. *Qumran.* The use of *šā'al* and the verbal noun *še'ēlâ* is quite similar to that in the OT. The semantic field "ask" includes the following passages. 11QT 55:2 and 14 basically cite Dt. 13:12 and 18 and address the apostasy of a city, a situation to be investigated commensurate with the legal regulations (55:5: par. *dāraš* and *ḥāqar*); cf. 4Q159 2:4 and 5 following Josh. 1:18 with reference to potential resistance and disobedience. 11QT 58:18 and 21 tie the king's decisions completely to the high-priestly oracle: "He shall not go until he has presented himself before the high priest, who shall inquire on his behalf for a decision by the Urim and Thummim" (l. 18; l. 20 repeats the prohibition elliptically: *šā'al bammišpāṭ).* 4QpIsa^c 21:11 cites Isa. 30:2 with its indictment of the alliance with Egypt without considering Yahweh's words of guidance as delivered through the prophet. The fragment Mur. 29 II, 3 deals with contractual demands deriving from the private legal sphere.[55]

The concentration of occurrences in 1QS is striking, including the use of the niphal in 8 of 9 occurrences. Every passage involves the Council of the Community or the Holy Council, which can be consulted in any matter (6:4; cf. CD 14:6) for counsel and guidance, particularly for legal decisions in cases involving transgression against the community rule; the procedure is to consult each member individually according to his rank within the council (6:9,11,15,18; 7:21[bis]). 1QS 8:25 stipulates that any member of the council who inadvertently transgresses a law "for two years shall take no part in judgment *(špṭ)* or ask for counsel."

The semantic element "request" emerges in the following texts. 4Q179 1, II, 8 alludes to Lam. 4:4 in saying that "(the children) beg for water, but no one offers it." In 11QPs^a 24 (Ps. 155), a construct of lament and thanksgiving, the petitioner asks (l. 4) that his request (*še'ēlâ*, par. *baqqāšâ*) be granted *(nāṯan)* and gives thanks in a confession of trust (l. 14) for its fulfillment *(šlm);* cf. also 4Q381 31:8.[56]

2. *LXX.* The LXX tries to accommodate the semantic polyvalence of *šā'al* with varied renderings. It translates the qal with *aiteín, apolégein, aspázesthai, danízein, engastrímythos, exereunán, eperōtán, epithymeín, ereunán, erōtán, zēteín, chrán, chrḗsis;* the piel with *epaiteín, eperōtán, erōtán;* the niphal with *aiteín* and *paraiteísthai;* and the hiphil with *kichrán* and *chrán.*[57]

Fuhs

55. J. T. Milik, *DJD,* II, 142.

56. On the Aramaic witnesses in Qumran, see Beyer, 698-99.

57. Cf. G. Stählin, "αἰτέω κτλ.," *TDNT,* I, 191-95; H. Greeven, "ἐρωτάω κτλ.," *TDNT,* II, 685-89.

שַׁאֲנָן *ša'ᵃnān;* *שׁאן *š'n*

Contents: I. Construction and Occurrences. II. The Verb. III. The Adjective. IV. Qumran and LXX.

I. Construction and Occurrences. The adj. *ša'ᵃnān,* covering the meanings "at rest, peaceful, carefree, self-confident," is constructed (analogous to → רענן *ra'ᵃnān*) through reduplication of the third radical of the root *š'n.*[1] The vb. *š'n* itself is also only attested in the reduplicate pilpel stem.

The root *š'n* is not attested in other ancient Near Eastern languages, the one exception being Ugaritic, since the Ugaritic forms *š'nt, š'n,* and *šin* probably derive from *š'n,* "be at rest, undisturbed, peaceful."[2] After Hebrew, *š'n* does not appear again until the more recent Semitic languages from Syriac on.[3] The possibility of transmission through Aramaic cannot be demonstrated, since *š'n* is not attested in Aramaic.

It is questionable whether the place name Beth-shean originally had anything to do with the root *š'n.* Given the analogy of other place names constructed similarly, one can assume that its second constituent part represents a (poorly attested) pre-Israelite divine name.[4] The translation "place of rest," taking *š'n* thus as the semantic point of departure, probably represents the Israelite understanding of the place name.[5]

The root *š'n* occurs 5 times in the MT as a verb and 11 times as an adjective, though 2 of the latter witnesses can be eliminated because in 2 K. 19:28 par. Isa. 37:29 *ša'ᵃnān* is probably not part of the original text (read *šᵉ'ônᵉḵā,* "your roaring"). The textual emendations adding *šā'an* in Prov. 14:17 and *ša'ᵃnān* in Zeph. 1:12 are too uncertain to be considered. Hence 14 reliable occurrences of the root *š'n* remain. It does not appear at all in the Pentateuch or the historical books, occurring instead only in poetic contexts. Occurrences are found in the prophetic books (*šā'an* in Jer. 30:10 par. 46:27; 48:11; *ša'ᵃnān* in Isa. 32:9,11,18; 33:20; Am. 6:1;[6] Zech. 1:15), wisdom writings (*šā'an* in Job 3:18; Prov. 1:33; *ša'ᵃnān* in Job 12:5; 21:23), and the Psalter (*ša'ᵃnān* in Ps. 123:4).

Almost all these occurrences are found in relatively late texts. If Isa. 32:9-14 does indeed belong to the later period of Isaiah, namely, the situation around 701 B.C.E., the occurrences in vv. 9 and 11 would represent the earliest witnesses.[7] Isa. 32:18 possibly

---

1. See *GK,* §55d; *NSS,* §143α.

2. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Einzelfragen zu Wörtern aus den ugaritischen Mythen und Wirtschaftstexten," *UF* 11 (1979) 191-92; *HAL,* III, 1374-75; cf. *WUS,* no. 2568; *UT,* no. 2371.

3. See the documentation in *LexHebAram,* 813.

4. A. Jirku, *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte und Archäologie Palästinas. FS E. Sellin* (Leipzig, 1927), 83-84.

5. H. Seebass, "Der israelitische Name der Bucht von Bēsān und der Name Beth Schean," *ZDPV* 95 (1979) 169-71; *HAL,* III, 1375.

6. See W. von Soden, "Zu einigen Ortsbenennungen bei Amos und Micha," *ZAH* 3 (1990) 215.

7. Though cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. trans. 2002), 249, who dates them to the period prior to 587.

dates to the end of the Judean monarchy,[8] as does Jer. 48:11 unless both texts are even later. All other passages date to the exilic and postexilic periods.

II. The Verb. All occurrences of the vb. *šā'an* are construed in the perfect or perfect consecutive. All have positive connotations and circumscribe restful, secure, undisturbed conditions in the past, present, and future. The oracle to the nations in Jer. 48:11-17 retrospectively describes the previous peaceful and undisturbed ease of Moab (v. 11: *š'n* par. *šqṭ*), which will now come to an end when the spoilers sent by Yahweh prepare Moab's doom. By contrast, the announcement of salvation in Jer. 30:10, cast in the form of a priestly oracle, promises that Jacob/Israel will be saved (*yš'* hiphil), will return from afar and enjoy a life in quiet *(šqṭ),* security *(š'n),* and without fear of being disturbed *('ên maḥᵃrîḏ).* Because the verse has apparently been influenced by Deutero-Isaiah and thus cannot date to the early proclamation of Jeremiah to the former northern kingdom, "Jacob/Israel" refers to the deported Judeans. A later passage secondarily repeats the verse (46:27).

Prov. 1:33 concludes the discourse delivered by personified Wisdom in which (sapiential) knowledge is identified with fear of Yahweh (v. 29). The final verses of the text quintessentially juxtapose the fate of those who do and do not understand, a fate determined by the act-consequence nexus. Those who reject this guidance prepare their own downfall, while those who accept the teaching of Wisdom prepare a happy fate for themselves; they "will be secure *(beṭaḥ)* and will live at ease *(š'n)* without dread of disaster," as articulated through *parallelismus membrorum* (v. 33). The term *bṭḥ* appears as a counterpart to *š'n* in Isa. 32:9,11,18; Am. 6:1 as well. Finally, in his complaints Job curses his own life and longs for death in which everyone, even prisoners, are at ease (Job 3:18).

III. The Adjective. The use of the adj. *ša'ᵃnān* is ambivalent in that the same positive meaning attaching to the verb is joined by a negative connotation. In this sense *ša'ᵃnān* refers to alleged ease, i.e., to illusionary security, wicked carefreeness, in a word: proud arrogance and hubris. It is above all prophetic oracles of judgment or their later interpretation that adduces such behavior as proof of guilt. In Isa. 32:9-14 the expressions "carefree, at ease" *(š'n)* and "complacent, all too trustful" *(bṭḥ)* function virtually as leitmotifs of accusation (vv. 9-10,11). The women thus qualified represent the inhabitants of the city whose downfall is predicted. "Those who are at ease in Zion" and "those who feel secure on Mount Samaria" similarly refer to the inhabitants of the two cities (beyond merely the upper classes) to whom the cry of woe in Am. 6:1-7 is directed, though the text in v. 1 with the juxtaposition of Zion and Samaria does represent a later interpretation by the Dtr redactors.[9] By inserting "those who are at ease *(š'n)* in Zion" into the text and thereby referring the charge of carefree self-confidence

8. H. Barth, *Die Jesaja-Worte in der Josiazeit. WMANT* 48 (1977), 211-13, who identifies it as a text of the Assyrian redaction from the time of Josiah.

9. See H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 269-70, 274-75.

— a charge originally aimed at the upper classes of Samaria — as well as the announcement of deportation (v. 7) to Jerusalem (and Judah), the redactors retroactively included the fall of Judah in 587 in Amos's message. The starting point was Amos's oracle of woe over "those who feel secure *(bṭḥ)* on Mount Samaria."

According to Zech. 1:15, God's wrath is coming upon the self-confident nations who have exploited their commission as Yahweh's own historical instruments. Though they are currently living in peace, they are about to encounter Yahweh's intervention in history; Yahweh will shatter their power and bring salvation for Israel. Ps. 123 issues in a lament over the "scorn of those who are at ease" (v. 4), apparently those who scorn and oppress the people or its members. It is unclear whether the reference is to foreign rulers (the Persians?) or to adversaries from one's own ranks. In the obscure verse Job 12:5, Job seems to take issue with the act-consequence nexus advocated by his friends. "Those at ease" *(ša'ᵃnān)* have contempt for the misfortune of others because they consider it well-deserved. The positive meaning of the adj. *ša'ᵃnān* emerges especially in the salvific promises in Isa. 32:18 and 33:20, which announce a peaceful, undisturbed future for Jerusalem and Judah. Isa. 32:15-20 is a salvific-prophetic later interpretation of the oracle of judgment in 32:9-14 and constitutes a conscious contrast to it. The key terms *š'n* and *bṭḥ* were apparently borrowed from that text and reinterpreted into salvific promises ("at ease" and "secure"). In 33:20 the expression "quiet meadow" (NRSV "quiet habitation," *nāweh ša'ᵃnān*) together with the other statements in the context serve to express the freedom and security Yahweh guarantees Jerusalem for the future.

The term *ša'ᵃnān* (read instead of *šal'ᵃnan*) has a theologically attenuated meaning in Job 21:23.[10] Here Job reacts to Zophar's explications about the mortal fate of the wicked in ch. 20 (where v. 20 uses the same term *šālēw* as does 21:23), countering that death overtakes the prosperous person who lives at ease and secure *(ša'ᵃnān wᵉšālêw)* just the same as it does the unhappy who have only known suffering in their lives. Hence death is merely human fate rather than punishment for the wicked.

IV. Qumran and LXX. The root *š'n* has not yet been attested in the Qumran writings, nor does it occur in the book of Sirach. The LXX gives *š'n* extremely varied renderings and sometimes seems to interpret rather than translate (cf. esp. *ploúsios* in Isa. 32:9; 33:20).

Thiel

---

10. On the context see E. A. Knauf, "Zum Text von Hi 21,23-26," *BN* 7 (1978) 22-24, who views v. 23 as a secondary verse "for text repair" (23).

שָׁאַף *šā'ap*

Contents: I. OT Occurrences. II. Hebrew Constructions and Meaning. III. OT Use: 1. "Gasp for Air": a. People; b. Animals; c. The Sun; 2. "Pant for Something"; 3. "Pester, Chase, Treat with Hostility." IV. LXX.

I. OT Occurrences. This verb occurs 14 times in the OT, but only in the qal and only in postexilic prophetic (Amos, Deutero-Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel) and wisdom (Psalms, Job, Ecclesiastes) texts (Am. 2:7, though probably older, requires a conjecture).

II. Hebrew Constructions and Meaning. The verbal root *š(ś)'p(f)* is not attested in other Semitic languages. The term *šā'ap* apparently represents a specifically Hebrew construction that presumably expresses onomatopoeically (the *peh* was already spirantized) the gasping and panting for air. Such gasping can result from exertion and exhaustion or from strong excitement and desire. This secondary derivation is comparable to Arab. *sahifa,* "thirst, snap at,"[1] and Heb. *š'p,* allegedly a secondary form of *š'p* with the meaning "snap at, snatch."[2] In this suggested etymological connection, the presumed secondary form of *šûp* (with reference to Aram. *šûp* and Syr. *šāp,* "grate, crush," and *šap,* "grind, crush"), namely, *š'p* II,[3] is questionable, since the passages in question (Ps. 56:2-3[Eng. 1-2]; Am. 8:4; Ezk. 36:3 [except Am. 2:7, where the context supports a derivation from *šûp,* "stamp on, crush"]) could well refer to the lusting of the enemy and persecutor.[4]

II. OT Use.

1. *"Gasp for Air."* a. *People.* As the departure from Babylon comes near, Yahweh, who has long kept silent toward the people's laments, will now introduce his intervention by crying out like a woman in labor and by gasping (*nāšam,* hapax legomenon; cf. *nešāmâ,* "breath") and panting *(šā'ap,* Isa. 42:14).

b. *Animals.* After God brings a great drought upon Judah, the otherwise tough wild asses, now plagued by thirst, "stand on the bare heights [and] pant for air like jackals" (Jer. 14:6). The prophet compares Israel, who has become unfaithful to Yahweh and now chases greedily after the Ba'als, with a wild ass in the wilderness, who in her passionate heat snuffs and gasps for air *(rûaḥ)* (Jer. 2:24).

c. *The Sun.* Eccl. 1:5 uses *šā'ap* metaphorically to describe the "course" of the sun (which Ps. 19:6[5] describes with → רוץ *rûṣ,* a verb of rapid movement). Because the

---

šā'ap. Y. I. Kim, "The Vocabulary of Oppression in the OT: *'šq, ynh, lḥṣ,* and Congeners" (diss., Drew University, Madison, N.J., 1981), esp. 46, 185-91.

1. K. Vollers, *Volkssprache und Schriftsprache im alten Arabien* (Strassburg, 1906), 97.
2. *HAL,* IV, 1446b.
3. *GesB,* 798; abandoned by *KBL*², 937.
4. *KBL*², 937.

sun has such a long way to go, it hurries "gasping" to the place where it rises (some lexicons emend *šô'ēp* to the pale, unpersuasive *šāḇ 'ap*[5]).

2. *"Pant for Something."* Gasping for air with an open mouth also functions as a metaphor for the desire with which a person longs for or thirsts for something. The slave working in the hot sun longs for shade *(ṣēl)* (at evening), a metaphor for those who long for peace and release (through death) from the toil and suffering of life (Job 7:2). Those tested by suffering, however, should not long for the night (of final judgment?) (Job 36:20). Once a person has fallen into distress, then the "thirsty" (cj. after Aquila; Symmachus; Vg.), i.e., the greedy (and those with nothing), pant (cj. pl. *šā'ᵃpû;* the cj. *šā'ᵃḇû,* "draw [water]," is not necessary[6]) after their possessions (Job 5:5). In Ps. 119:131 the author of this torah psalm opens his mouth wide and pants after the commandments of the Lord full of longing *(yā'aḇ),* reflecting the rather mythical notion that the word of God is like honey-sweet food for the soul (cf. v. 103; Ps. 19:11[10]; Ezk. 2:8–3:3; also Jer. 15:16 and Ps. 81:11[10] Tg.).

3. *Pester, Chase, Treat with Hostility.* Such panting and gasping also describes the effort and wrath of the enemy who unceasingly and with all his energy pursues someone else in order to "snap him up," or the greediness driving the stronger person to grab the possessions of the weaker.

In Ps. 56:2(1) *šā'ap* (EÜ "hunt, pursue"; or "lust after"[7]) parallels *lāḥaṣ,* "oppress," and in v. 3(2) also *lāḥam,* "fight against," so that the ptcp. *šô'ēp* in Ps. 57:4(3) (LXX and Pesh., 1st person pl. suf.[8]) can virtually be translated as "enemy" (EÜ; NRSV "those who trample upon me") or "pursuers." Ezekiel is to promise fertility and blessing to the desolate mountains of Israel because the enemy has snapped at them from all sides in order to possess them (Ezk. 36:3).[9]

Am. 8:4 accuses the greedy and deceptive merchants of having pursued the socially weak (cf. Job 5:5). In the same reproach directed toward Israel in Am. 2:7, both the prepositional obj. *bᵉrō'š* and the addendum[10] *'al-'ᵃpar-ereṣ* (to [into the?] dust) militate against the translation "pursue, chase." The meaning is probably "trample the head" (so also NRSV; LXX *pateín;* in Ps. 56:2-3[1-2] and 57:4[3], the LXX translates *šā'ap* with *katapateín*), which is why some scholars assume a vb. *šā'ap* II, "trample, crush,"[11] or — more plausibly — conjecture a secondary form *šûp (BHS: šāpîm* instead of *šō'ᵃpîm*), "trample" (as in Gen. 3:15bα).[12]

---

5. *KBL*², 937; *BHS.*

6. *KBL*², 937; so also G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 132.

7. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), in loc.

8. G. R. Driver, "Studies in the Vocabulary of the OT," *JTS* 33 (1931) 38-39, conjectures *šō'ᵃpê napšî* from v. 5.

9. *KBL*², 937, suggests *ûšᵉ'ōp* for *wᵉšā'ōp,* while *BHS* conjectures *wᵉšā'ōṭ.*

10. See B. Duhm, "Anmerkungen zu den Zwölf Propheten," *ZAW* 31 (1911) 3.

11. *GesB,* 798.

12. *KBL*², 956, distinguishes between *šûp* I, "crush," and *šûp* II, "snap at, make a grab for."

IV. LXX. The LXX translates *šāʾap* with a wide variety of terms, and not always accurately. When the meaning is "gasp for air," it translates *hélkein (ánemon), pneumatophoreísthai, xāraínein.* For the meaning "long for, pant after," it uses *hélkein pneúma, exélkein, eksiphōnízein, teúchein.* And for the meaning "pursue, hunt after," it uses *(kata)pateín, miseísthai,* and *ektríbein.*

Maiberger

שְׁאֵר *šᵉʾēr*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. OT. IV. Qumran. V. LXX.

I. Etymology. Terms corresponding to Heb. *šᵉʾēr,* "flesh, meat," include Ugar. *šîr,*[1] the customary word for "flesh";[2] Akk. *šīru,* "flesh, body"[3] (also in the combination "your flesh and blood" = your relative); and Pun. *šʾr,* "flesh" (said of sacrificial meat in the Marseille Tariff; cf. also *ṣmḥ šʾrm,* "shoot of your flesh" = son[4]).

II. Occurrences. This word occurs 16 times in the OT (in Jer. 51:35 read *šiḇrî* instead of *šᵉʾērî*) and once in Sir. 7:24.

III. OT. The term *šᵉʾēr* refers first of all to "flesh, meat" as foodstuff, e.g., in the despairing or derisive question the people pose in the wilderness according to Ps. 78:20: "[He provided water,] can he also give bread, or provide meat for his people?" Similarly also in God's reaction to the question in v. 27: "he rained flesh upon them like dust" (in reference to the quail). The term *šᵉʾēr* is generally understood to have the same meaning in Ex. 21:10, which stipulates that a man who has married a slave and then enters into a second marriage "not diminish the flesh [food], clothing, or marital rights of the first wife" (if, as some interpreters do,[5] one understands *šᵉʾēr* as a reference to fleshly, physical satisfaction, then in order to avoid repetition one must understand *ʿōnâ* at the end of the verse as "oil of anointing").

The term *šᵉʾēr* also refers to the body as part of the person, as in Prov. 11:17: "Those who are kind reward themselves *(napšô),* but the cruel do harm to their own bodies *(šᵉʾēr),*" i.e., both good and evil deeds come back to the initiator. Here probably no distinction is being made between body and *nepeš,* both referring rather to the entire person. When Sir. 7:24 advises fathers to guard and preserve *(nṣr)* the *šᵉʾēr* (LXX *sṓma*) of their daughters, the reference is obviously to the woman's body as an object of lustful

1. Cf. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 401-2.
2. *WUS,* no. 2569.
3. *AHw,* III, 1248-49.
4. *KAI* 163.3; Marseille Tariff: *KAI* 69.3,4,6,8,10,11; *ANET,* 656-57.
5. R. North, "Flesh, Covering, and Response, Ex. xxi 10," *VT* 5 (1955) 205-6.

desire.[6] Mic. 3:2 clearly distinguishes between flesh (*šᵉʾēr*) and bones (*ʿeṣem*); here dishonest judges tear the flesh from the people's bones and the skin from their bodies. The continuation says that they then eat the flesh (*šᵉʾēr*) of the people; now the vocabulary changes, and the word *bāśār* is used when the reference is to chopping up the flesh (*bāśār*) in a kettle (v. 3; no transposition of vv. 2b and 3 is necessary[7]). The "flesh and heart" refer to the entire person who is fading or faltering (*kālâ,* Ps. 73:26). By contrast, Prov. 5:11 uses both *šᵉʾēr* and *bāśār* with the same verb to describe the consequences of getting mixed up with the "strange woman."

Like Akk. *šīru, šᵉʾēr* can also refer to physical kinship. The expression *šᵉʾēr bᵉśārô* means essentially "his own flesh and blood," i.e., his "living relations."[8] One should not have sexual relations with one's own relatives (Lev. 18:6; cf. v. 12, which uses *šᵉʾēr ʾāḇîḵā,* "the near kinswoman of your father"; Lev. 20:19 uses *šᵉʾērô*). A blood relative is to step in as *gōʾēl* (Lev. 25:49). Lev. 21:2 defines *šᵉʾēr* as mother, father, son, brother, and in some instances daughter; a priest is permitted to touch their corpses. Nu. 27:11 addresses the problem of inheritance rights. If a person dies childless, ultimately "the nearest kinsman" (*šᵉʾēr qārôḇ*) receives the inheritance. Lev. 18:11 distinguishes between relatives on the father's and on the mother's side.

IV. Qumran. The Damascus Document also uses *šᵉʾēr* 5 times in reference to kinship. CD 5:9 cites Lev. 18:13 (cf. 5:11). CD 7:1 warns against disloyalty (*māʿal*) toward *šᵉʾēr bᵉśārô,* while 8:6 and 19:19 mention those who hide themselves from their own kin (*ʿlm* hithpael), an allusion to Isa. 58:7, which, however, uses only *bāśār.* One other occurrence (4Q186 1, I, 6) is only a fragment.

V. LXX. The LXX usually translates with *sárx,* though occasionally also with *kréas* or *sṓma.* References to kinship use various forms of *oikeíos.* Ex. 21:10 paraphrases with *tá déonta,* while Ps. 78:20 translates as *trápeza.*

Ringgren

6. E. Schweizer, "σῶμα," *TDNT,* VII, 1044.
7. See D. R. Hillers, *Micah. Herm* (1984), 42.
8. *HAL,* IV, 1379.

שָׁאַר *šā'ar*; שְׁאָר *š^e'ār*; שְׁאֵרִית *š^e'ērîṯ*

Contents: I. Etymology and Meaning. II. General Use: 1. Things; 2. Abstractions; 3. Individuals; 4. Nations. III. The Remnant as the Community of Israel: 1. Deuteronomistic History; 2. Isaiah; 3. Jeremiah; 4. Ezekiel; 5. Minor Prophets; 6. Chronicler's History; 7. LXX and Qumran.

šā'ar. J. C. Campbell, "God's People and the Remnant," *SJT* 3 (1950) 78-85; O. Carena, *Il resto di Israele; studio storico-comparativo delle iscrizioni reali assire e dei testi profetici sul tema del Resto. RivB Sup* 13 (1985); A. Causse, "Les origines de la diaspora juive," *RHPR* 7 (1927) 97-128; idem, *Du groupe éthnique à la communauté religieuse. Le problème sociologique de la religion d'Israël* (Paris, 1937); R. E. Clements, "'A Remnant Chosen by Grace (Romans 11:5)': The OT Background and Origin of the Remnant Concept," *Pauline Studies. FS F. F. Bruce* (Grand Rapids, 1980), 106-21; R. J. Coggins, "The Origins of the Jewish Diaspora," in R. E. Clements, ed., *The World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge, 1989), 163-81; N. A. Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums* (Oslo, 1941 [1962]); G. Henton Davies, "Remnant," in A. Richardson, ed., *A Theological Wordbook of the Bible* (New York, [2]1962), 188-91; H. Dittmann, "Der Heilige Rest im AT," *TSK* 87 (1914) 603-18; S. Garofalo, *Na nozione profetica del "resto d'Israele"* (Rome, 1942); G. Gerleman, "Rest und Überschuss: Eine terminologische Studie," *Travels in the World of the OT. FS M. A. Beek* (Assen, 1974), 71-74; D. Greeves, "The Remnant of Israel," *ExpT* 94 (1982); H. Gross, "Remnant," in J. B. Bauer, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology* (Eng. trans., London, 1970), II, 741-43; V. Hamp, "Rest, heiliger Rest. I. AT," *LThK,* VIII, 1252-53; P. D. Hanson, *The People Called: The Growth of Community in the Bible* (San Francisco, 1986); C. Hardmeier, *Prophetie im Streit vor dem Untergang Judas. BZAW* 187 (1990); G. F. Hasel, *The Remnant: The History and Theology of the Remnant Idea from Genesis to Isaiah. Andrews University Monographs* 5 (Berrien Springs, 1972); idem, "Semantic Values of Derivatives of the Hebrew Root *Š'R,*" *AUSS* 11 (1973) 152-69; idem, "Remnant," *IBDSup,* 735-36; J. Hausmann, *Israels Rest. Studien zum Selbstverständnis der nachexilischen Gemeinde. BWANT* 124 (1987); E. W. Heaton, "The Root שאר and the Doctrine of the Remnant," *JTS* 3 (1952) 27-39; V. Herntrich and G. Schrenk, "λεῖμμα κτλ.," *TDNT,* IV, 196-214; E. Jenni, "Remnant," *IDB,* IV, 32-33; J. Jeremias, "Der Gedanke des 'Heiligen Restes' im Spätjudentum und in der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZNW* 42 (1949) 184-94 = idem, *ABBA. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1966), 121-32; O. Kaiser, "Rest," *BHHW,* III, 1592-93; J. G. McConville, "Ezra-Nehemiah and the Fulfillment of Prophecy," *VT* 36 (1986) 205-24, esp. 213-18; J. Meinhold, *Studien zur israelitischen Religionsgeschichte I. Der heilige Rest* (Bonn, 1903); B. F. Meyer, "Jesus and the Remnant of Israel," *JBL* 84 (1965) 123-30; W. E. Müller, *Die Vorstellung vom Rest im AT* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, [2]1973); J. Nelis, "Rest Israels," *BL,* 1473-75; C. R. North, "Shear-jashub," *IDB,* IV, 311; J. Paterson, "Remnant," *HDB,* 841-42; O. Schilling, "'Rest' in der Prophetie des AT" (diss., Münster, 1942); C. R. Seitz, *Theology in Conflict. BZAW* 176 (1989); W. T. In der Smitten, "Marginalien zur Restverstellung im AT," *BiOr* 30 (1973) 9-10; R. de Vaux, "The 'Remnant of Israel' according to the Prophets," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Eng. trans., Garden City, N.Y., 1971), 15-30; H. Wildberger, "שאר *š'r* to remain," *TLOT,* III, 1284-92; H. G. M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge, 1977); idem, "The Concept of Israel in Transition," in R. E. Clements, ed., *The World of Ancient Israel* (Cambridge, 1989), 141-61; H. W. Wolff, "Das Thema 'Umkehr' in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie," *ZTK* 48 (1951) 129-48, esp. 138, 140; P. Zerafa, "Il resto di Israele nei profeti preesilice," *Angelicum* 49 (Rome, 1972) 3-29.

On III.2: S. H. Blank, "The Current Misinterpretation of Isaiah's *SHE'AR YASHUB,*" *JBL* 67

I. *Etymology and Meaning.* Although this root is not attested in Akkadian, it does occur in Ugaritic as the vb. *š'r,* "remain (back)," subst. *š'r,* "remnant"; as Imperial Aram. *š'r, š'rt;* Nabat. *š'ryt;* Palmyr. *š'r;* Jewish Aram. *š'r, s'r';* Syr. *š^eyārā,* "remnant"; OSA *s'r;* and Arab. *sa'ira,* "be left over," and *sā'ir,* "remnant; left over, all."[1]

The verb occurs 133 times in the OT, including 94 times in the niphal, 38 in the hiphil, and yet only once in the qal (1 S. 16:11). The subst. *š^e'ār* occurs 27 times (also 12 Aramaic occurrences). Finally, *š^e'ērîṯ* occurs 66 times. Almost half of the Hebrew occurrences of *š^e'ār* are in Isaiah (10–28), while the occurrences of *š^e'ērîṯ* are clearly concentrated in Jeremiah (24 times).

In the OT this verb refers to that which is left over or remains. The two substantival derivatives of the verbal stem, *š^e'ār* and *š^e'ērîṯ,* occur in a rather broad collection of contexts without any clearly discernible semantic distinction emerging between them in reference to that which remains or is left over, something theoretically conceivable in the enumeration of things or concepts. In many passages, however, both the verb and the substantival derivatives refer to those who physically survive or to the remnant of a group of people.

This concrete meaning is used in connection with disasters, for example, floods, famines, and war, which force a family or a larger group of people to the edge of their existence. A clear theological meaning attaches to this notion of "that which remains or is left behind" when it refers to a group of people in a biblical context, since such contexts also involve questions of the continuity of tradition or, even more importantly, of legitimate authority and identity in reference to membership in a community. The largely negative

---

(1948) 211-15; J. Day, "Shear-jashub (Isaiah VII 3) and 'the Remnant of Wrath' (Psalm LXXVI 11)," *VT* 31 (1981) 76-78; F. Dreyfus, "La doctrine du 'Reste d'Israël' chez le prophète Isaïe," *RSPT* 39 (1955) 361-86; idem, "Reste d'Israël," *DBS,* 10, 414-47 (bibliog.); R. Fey, *Amos und Jesaja. Abhängigkeit und Eigenständigkeit des Jesaja. WMANT* 12 (1963), esp. 140-41; T. J. Gaehr, "Shear-jashub or the Remnant Sections in Isaiah," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 79 (1922) 363-71; A. H. J. Gunneweg, "Heils- und Unheilsverkündigung in Jes VII," *VT* 15 (1965) 27-34; G. F. Hasel, "Linguistic Considerations Regarding the Translation of Isaiah's *Shear-Jashub:* A Reassessment," *AUSS* 9 (1971) 36-46; R. Kilian, "Prolegomena zur Auslegung der Immanuelverheissung," *Wort, Lied und Gottespruch. FS J. Ziegler. FzB* 2 (1972), 207-15, esp. 210-14; L. Köhler, "Syntactica II," *VT* 3 (1953) 84-85; E. Lipiński, "Le שאר ישוב d'Isaïe VII 3," *VT* 23 (1973) 245-46; W. Metzger, "Der Horizont der Gnade in der Berufungsvision Jesajas," *ZAW* 93 (1981) 281-84; L. G. Rignell, "Das Immanuelzeichen," *ST* 11 (1958) 99-119, esp. 101-2; J. M. P. Smith, "שְׁאָר יָשׁוּב," *ZAW* 34 (1914) 219-24; O. H. Steck, "Rettung und Verstockung. Exegetische Bemerkungen zu Jesaja 7,3-9," *EvT* 33 (1973) 77-90 = *Wahrnehmungen Gottes im AT. ThB* 70 (1982), 171-86; U. Stegemann, "Der Restgedanke bei Isaias," *BZ* 13 (1969) 161-86; J. Vermeylen, *Du prophète Isaïe à l'apocalyptique* (2 vols.; Paris, 1977-82); W. Werner, *Eschatologische Texte in Jesaja 1–39. FzB* 46 (1982); E. Würthwein, "Jesaja 7,1-9. Ein Beitrag zum Thema 'Prophetie und Politik,'" *Theologie als Glaubenswagnis. FS K. Heim* (1954), 47-63.

1. Ugaritic: *KTU* 1.18, IV, 15; 4.290, 3; cf. *WUS,* no. 866; on *KTU* 2.72, 33, cf. G. J. Brooke, "The Textual, Formal and Historical Significance of Ugaritic Letter RS 34.124 (= *KTU* 2.72)," *UF* 11 (1979) 78-79; on the substantive see *KTU* 1.6, II, 37; cf. *WUS,* no. 2570; on Palmyrene: *DNSI,* II, 1098; Jewish Aramaic: *TW,* 444; Syriac: *LexSyr,* 774; OSA: Biella, 322; Beeston, 121; Arab.: cf. Wehr, 391.

connotations normally associated with the post-catastrophe remnant of a family or community thus acquired a positive character with regard to claims, privileges, and status.

To the extent that the semantic use of the various verbal forms of *š'r* and its substantival derivatives *šᵉ'ār* and *šᵉ'ēriṯ* are concerned, one should point out that a large number of the passages are actually theologically neutral. In such cases the root simply refers to that which remains in any given counting. Only when the terms refer to those who remain or are left over from Israel and Judah do they acquire an important theological sense. At the same time, however, one must remember that because obedience was the necessary condition of full membership in the community chosen by God, the notion arose that a surviving remnant would thus represent the believing minority. Such notions occur in both prophetic and narrative texts. Finally, the rescue of a faithful remnant can also be viewed as a principle of divine actions toward human communities, something clearly emerging in the Flood narrative (Gen. 6–9) with its ancient Near Eastern background. Here the survival of Noah's family during a global catastrophe demonstrates the principle of rescue from divine judgment. Once the political and sociological weight of the claim to the status of a remnant acquired central significance in the religious life of the Jews, earlier narrative traditions could be reinterpreted in light of this development.

II. General Use.

1. *Things.* The basic meaning "remain, be left over" emerges most clearly when the verb refers to things remaining over from a larger quantity. It refers to property and livestock in Gen. 47:18, when the Egyptian people, plagued by famine, plead with Joseph for help from the stores of the pharaonic warehouses; the Egyptians insist they have no food left over. In Ex. 10:5 the locust plague similarly threatens to devour all that was still left to the Egyptians after the previous plagues. Part of the curse of Dt. 28:51 and 55 is similarly that no food will be left over. During normal harvest periods, wine growers are supposed to leave the gleanings for the poor (Jer. 49:9). The plague narrative in Ex. 8:27 ascertains that the swarm of flies has ended by remarking that "nothing remained" of them. Similar statements apply to the locust plague (10:19) and the frog plague (8:5,7). Frogs remain only in the Nile. Pharaoh's cavalry is similarly destroyed such that none is left over (14:28). No livestock belonging to the Israelites is to remain in Egypt (10:26).

The verb is also used in connection with the blood of a sin offering, part of which is sprinkled on the side of the altar while the rest is drained out onto the floor (Lev. 5:9). The regulations for Passover make clear that no meat of the sacrificial lamb is to remain till the following morning (*ytr,* Ex. 12:10).

"That which is left over" can refer to meat (1 S. 9:24), horses (2 K. 7:13), or silver (2 Ch. 24:14). The verb can refer both to the portion of the land of Israel left in Canaanite hands after Joshua's campaign (Josh. 13:1f.) and to the trunk of the broken idol of Dagon (1 S. 5:4). After the attack of the Babylonians, only the cities of Azekah and Lachish were left unconquered (Jer. 34:7). All these passages using the verbal or substantival forms of *š'r* relate that part of something remains, or they categorically point out that in fact nothing at all remains.

2. *Abstractions.* The assertion that something abstract "remains" merely expands the concrete basic meaning. Lev. 25:52 uses the verb to refer to the remaining or outstanding years of slavery that must still be served before the Jubilee Year brings liberation. 2 Ch. 9:29 uses the verb to refer to the "rest" of Solomon's story, which the narrative does not intend to relate. Dnl. 10:8 confirms that the visionary had no strength left after a particular vision, comparable to the condition in which he had no breath (v. 17).

The reference in Job's defense against his friends is more difficult (Job 21:34); here Job insists that his friends' assertions leave nothing behind but emptiness. The LXX does not translate the vb. *š'r* here, presumably because the translator no longer understood its meaning.[2]

3. *Individuals.* The notion that a remnant remains after a larger portion has been enumerated or destroyed comes to clearest or most direct expression in reference to individuals and families. Such is the case in the story of the wise woman of Tekoa who tells David about her only remaining son (2 S. 14:7). When he too is threatened with execution for the murder of his brother, the entire family is threatened with having no future heir and the mother herself with having no one to help her. Isa. 49:21 applies to Jerusalem the similar metaphor of a woman who as a widow is left alone without children.

The widow Naomi is portrayed the same way; although at first she has two sons (Ruth 1:3), after their death she is left alone with her daughters-in-law (v. 5). A similar situation emerges in Gen. 42:38 when Jacob insists that after Joseph's presumed death his youngest son, Benjamin, not accompany his brothers to Egypt, since Benjamin is now the only one (i.e., the only son of Rachel) left. During the revolution of Jehu, the entire royal house of Ahab is extinguished; no one was left (2 K. 10:11; cf. also v. 17). Og, the king of Bashan during the Israelite land conquest, is described as the only survivor of the Rephaim (Dt. 3:11; Josh. 13:12). Not a single person among the Anakim was left in the land (Josh. 11:22), though the author acknowledges that other nations did indeed remain in the land (Josh. 23:4,7,12; cf. also Dt. 7:20). Allegedly no one was left from the army of Sisera (Jgs. 4:16; cf. also the violence of the battle of Ai in Josh. 8:17). 1 S. 11:11 documents the small number of survivors among the Ammonites after the massacre of Saul.

Accounts associated with the Dtr interest in the annihilation of the pre-Israelite inhabitants of the land make several references to the violence of war and the desire to leave no one alive (Josh. 8:22; 10:28,30,37,39,40; 11:8,14). The Midianites (Jgs. 6:4) and Hazael of Syria (2 K. 13:7) threaten the Israelites with the same fate; Saul plans to do the same thing to the Philistines (1 S. 14:36), as do Israel and Judah to Moab (2 K. 3:25).

When threatened by Esau, Jacob fears the complete annihilation of his family and thus divides his possessions and people into two companies, enhancing thereby the

2. See E. Dhorme, *The Book of Job* (Eng. trans., New York, 1967), 235.

prospect that at least one group will survive (Gen. 32:9[Eng. 8]). David threatened to exterminate all male descendants from Nabal's family (1 S. 25:22). Numerous passages document the annihilation of families and national groups in wars in which either no one at all or only a few people survive. Famine caused by sieges can also bring about such catastrophes (cf. 2 K. 7:13).

A more positive understanding of the "remnant" emerges in narratives emphasizing the importance of a surviving male heir for securing the future of a family. Such applies especially to the royal houses (Jeroboam I, 1 K. 15:29; Ahaziah, 2 K. 10:11,14,17; Baasha, 1 K. 16:11; Joram, 2 Ch. 21:17). Concern with the survival of an heir for the family is directly associated with inheritance regulations and with a sense of familial identity.

Such expectations are enhanced even further when associated with the notion of God's special acts of election, as in the election of young David to be king. In the narrative it is precisely the youngest and hence least promising of Jesse's sons who is left and whom a selection procedure accordingly shows to be the intended one (1 S. 16:11). In a different context Eldad and Medad, who have remained behind in the Israelite camp, are seized by prophetic ecstasy (Nu. 11:26). Passages mentioning a small surviving remnant include references to the male prostitutes left after Asa's religious reforms (1 K. 22:47), the few women remaining in the royal palace during the Babylonians' siege of Jerusalem (Jer. 38:22), or the few wounded soldiers lying in their tents at that time (37:10) or left in the city of Jerusalem itself (38:4).

The notion that special divine initiative can lead to the preservation of a single family or even of individual family members finds its most dramatic expression in the story of the great flood. The narrative emphasizes that only Noah and his family remained (Gen. 7:23); their survival is understood as an event prompted by prophetic premonition and is interpreted as the expression of divine favor. This story of Noah's survival and his resulting role as the ancestor of all postdiluvian generations was quickly taken as a paradigm for the theological significance of the remnant (cf. Sir. 44:17), serving to associate the notion of divine judgment on the majority of human beings with the rescue of a small, divinely chosen group of surviving believers[3] and providing a meaningful narrative model upon which later interpretations of Jewish self-understanding were based, interpretations surviving in the Christian church in a directly comparable fashion. A comparable, albeit less dramatic and universal example of such a remnant whose election is viewed as the fulfillment of a divine plan is the narrative of the selection of the ten thousand armed warriors who are to follow Gideon (Jgs. 7:3).

The fate of those who survive a war and must deal with the famine and pestilence generally accompanying wars is portrayed as miserable and wretched. Imprecatory formulae accordingly often include references to such negative circumstances (on Israel: Lev. 26:36,39; on nations threatening Israel: Dt. 7:20). A passage regulating the punishment for perjury invokes the deterrent effect exerted by such punishment upon those who witness the punishment, i.e., upon those who are left (Dt. 19:20). This

3. See Hasel, *Remnant,* 135-47.

special emphasis on the deterrent effect of punishment upon those who witness it reveals the ongoing problems within Israel's developing legal system caused by false accusations.

4. *Nations.* It is especially prophetic texts that mention the fate of those among Israel's neighboring nations who are left over. In most cases such texts refer to the small number or to the miserable circumstances of the survivors of these nations after war. Such references often appear as threats in oracles against foreign nations. Although in a few cases the context shows that Israel and Judah are viewed as the reason for such threats, more often such prophecies show that these nations were affected by the same catastrophes accompanying the Assyrian and Babylonian expansion into the eastern Mediterranean. In 1 S. 14:36 Saul suggests attacking the Philistines and decimating them such that not a single man remains alive. The mention of the remnant of the Philistines in Am. 1:8 reflects the serious military losses suffered by the Philistines during David's rise to royal power in Israel. Additional military catastrophes affecting this nation around the mid-6th century are reflected in the mention of the remnant of Ashdod (Jer. 25:20) and the Philistines, and of Caphtor and the Anakim (47:4-5; cf. *BHS*). Ezk. 25:16 refers to them as the "rest of the seacoast."

An assault on Moab by the united military forces of Israel and Judah left the region of Kir-hareseth decimated (2 K. 3:25). The later destruction of Moabite territory, probably by the Assyrians, is reflected in Isa. 15:9 (cf. also 16:14) in the reference to the remnant of the land of Moab. Am. 9:12 mentions the remnant of Edom in what is probably a reference to a longer period of decimation in the country. Jer. 50:26 issues a warning before the final destruction of Babylon that will leave nothing remaining.

All these examples reveal the characteristically negative assumption that the survivors, those left over in a country after a period of war and decimation, function as witnesses to the suffering of their fellow citizens. The small number of survivors and the decimation of their cities and country emphasize the severity of the judgment against their particular national group. Hence such passages largely concur that the survival of such a remnant attests the severity of the catastrophe itself. Only if there are no survivors at all would there also be no witness; in that case, however, judgment is total. The survival of a remnant offers visible proof of the suffering of the unfortunate. Passages mentioning the fate of non-Israelite nations exhibit no interest at all in any notion of legitimate continuity or legal claim of possession that might be due such a remnant. This negative assumption attaching to the role of the remnant as a witness to a catastrophe also consistently applies to the earliest references to the remnant of Israel, though later passages containing such warnings do attest a more positive understanding of the role of the remnant in association with the hope in a reestablishment of Israel itself.

III. The Remnant as the Community of Israel. As far as the kingdoms of Israel and Judah are concerned, the claims by those who survived the catastrophe to be the salient remnant acquired special significance after the destruction visited upon them by the Assyrian Empire during the 8th century. The subsequent destruction of Judah and

Jerusalem by the Babylonians in the 6th century underscored the theological significance of the concept of a surviving remnant.

The notion of a remnant of the people of Israel lost many of its earlier negative associations and was engaged particularly to articulate the notion of the legitimate possession of the territory the people had once inhabited. The same notion also acquired special religious significance in connection with the right to administer the Jerusalem temple and its cult.

After 587 B.C.E. both these factors acquired heightened significance because of the lack of any centralized royal administration in Jerusalem. Subjection to Babylonian and later to Persian foreign rule fostered a disinclination to have religious matters under foreign jurisdiction. The extended deportation and migration of earlier inhabitants of Judah also prompted the postulation of a religious law that could claim validity beyond merely national boundaries. Such a corpus of regulations was necessary to identify those who wanted to maintain a justified claim to identity as part of the remnant of ancient Israel. In particular, the notion of a recognized status as "remnant of Israel" served as a basis of religious and social identity for the growing number of Jews who lived outside the territorial boundaries of the earlier kingdoms of Judah and Israel. Emergent Judaism in the Diaspora found in these claims of an identity as the "remnant of Israel" a useful concept for maintaining its own religious and social uniqueness. At the same time the necessity of such claims of recognition for those Jews who had indeed remained after 587 B.C.E. or who did not return until the late 6th or early 5th century served to articulate the complex nature of the severe political and religious disputes that arose during precisely this period.

Two factors were particularly influential in determining the meaning of the terminology associated with the "remnant" for post-587-B.C.E. Judaism. The first was the strong emphasis on unqualified loyalty to Yahweh and to the Mosaic Torah, an emphasis that emerged in the early-7th-century Dtn movement. The second factor emerged from the growing use of this written Torah as a sign of religious identity transcending political boundaries. Because Israel was no longer a nation, and because many of the intensely loyal Jews who hoped that Israel itself would be reestablished no longer lived within the former territorial boundaries, this recognition as the "remnant of Israel" helped define their particular Jewish status. In and of itself, the mere use of this word could not, however, resolve the inherent tensions confronting Israel as a group of separate and independent communities. The terminology was nonetheless of enormous importance, since it enabled one's claim as a Jew to be maintained, something applying particularly to the many Jews who would otherwise be excluded according to traditional, territorial, or political categories.

It was a long process through which this particular religious and social meaning came to be attached to the remnant terminology, whose meaning originally referred simply to those who had remained or who had survived the fall of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Although the process extended over at least three centuries, the decisive development took place during the 6th century and is broadly documented in the OT prophetic writings, particularly in the books of Isaiah and Jeremiah. The chronology of events is often rather obscure in Isaiah because earlier prophecies

were later reworked and reinterpreted. Although the interpretive changes are more clearly discernible in the book of Jeremiah, here too the chronology remains uncertain. The remaining OT writings illuminate and confirm this prophetic development without adding anything significantly new. At the end of the OT epoch itself, the various claims to identity as a legitimate "remnant of Israel" constituted an important characteristic of the emerging religious parties. Many problems, however, remained unresolved because neither territorial nor cultic nor kinship-based factors were able completely to define one's identity as a member of the remnant. The tensions generated by these ambiguities came to expression in the ideals of the competing sectarian groups toward the end of the OT period.

1. *Deuteronomistic History.* It is in the Dtr History that one first encounters the notion that Israel has been reduced to a remnant after the territorial fragmentation of Israel by the 8th-century Assyrian campaigns. This conviction comes to clearest expression in 2 K. 17:18, a Dtr summary explaining the effects of the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C.E. in words recalling Israel's total destruction as a nation: "Therefore Yahweh was very angry with Israel and removed them out of his sight; none was left but the tribe of Judah alone." Here the claim is made that the inheritance of Israel has passed completely to the control of Judah, a claim based on the conviction that Judah was more loyal to Yahweh, especially with regard to the maintenance of the claims of the Davidic dynasty. This notion comes to fuller expression in the narrative of Hezekiah's rescue from Sennacherib's attempt to destroy both Judah and Jerusalem (2 K. 19:4). Additional references to the remnant in 2 K. 19:30(+ *pᵉlêṭâ*),31 (= Isa. 37:31,32) show that Judah too was considerably weakened by the Assyrians and suffered territorial losses. The latter verse is clearly dependent on the highly characteristic and impressive development of the idea of the remnant in Isaiah. The general impression is that 2 K. 17:18 represents the original understanding of the Dtr historian that later redactors then tried to define more closely in 2 K. 19. The general claim is that Judah is the heir of Israel appointed by God, though the authors do make clear that this appointment does not include all of Judah.

2. *Isaiah.* The doctrine of the role of Israel's remnant comes to especially vivid expression in the book of Isaiah (cf. Stegemann; Clements). Two basic, unquestionably authentic passages must be examined that have been particularly influential. The first dates to the time of the Syro-Ephraimite War (736-733 B.C.E.) and focuses on the name of the prophet's son *šᵉ'ār-yāšûḇ,* "a remnant shall return" (Isa. 7:3), a name interpreted as a reference to the end of the threat to Ahaz by the Syro-Ephraimite alliance (vv. 4-9). Although the name does imply confident assurance here, it apparently also has a threatening connotation. As an assurance of help to Ahaz and his royal house, the statement is best understood as an announcement that a remnant of the hostile powers threatening Ahaz and Jerusalem will return to their own home as vanquished parties (cf. Clements). Considerable difficulties confront alternative attempts to interpret the name positively as a reference to the existence of a remnant (of Judah) that is to serve as a sign of hope for the royal house, not least because such views fail to consider the consistently negative implications attaching to references to a "remnant" in the case of

non-Israelite nations.[4] Only in the subsequent expansion of meaning does such reference to a remnant acquire positive connotations.

The second significant text, Isa. 17:1-3, similarly dates to the period of the Syro-Ephraimite War and warns that "the remnant of Aram will be like the *kāḇôḏ* [= military power] of the Israelites." Here too the existence of a remnant stands as a symbol of military defeat. The clear warning that Syria's army will be reduced to a remnant is amplified in the ensuing text by a similar warning to Israel itself (vv. 4-6), which, while explaining that the army of this nation too will be beaten, uses the agricultural metaphor of the gleanings left after the grain and olive harvests (vv. 5-6).

In the late 6th or early 5th century, the editors of this prophetic book added a whole series of later interpretations to both these key passages. The name *šᵉʾār-yāšûḇ* is now directly applied to Israel and in 10:20-23 acquires three different interpretations.[5] Verse 20 offers the assurance that the remnant will no longer be politically subject to Assyria (the idea of the remnant seems to be associated here with the "rod" metaphor in 9:3[4]). Verse 21 understands the idea of the remnant of Israel as a sign of hope, while v. 22 negatively alters this statement to mean that the future community of Israel will be but a remnant. Finally, the statement becomes a warning regarding the destruction of the land as decreed by Yahweh (v. 23; cf. 6:11-13).

Isa. 17:4-6 develops the metaphor of the post-harvest gleanings as a sign of the remnant in oracles attributed to Isaiah in 37:30-32 (= 2 K. 19:29-31). Although the agricultural metaphor is maintained, the remnant is now localized in Jerusalem and on Mt. Zion (cf. also 14:32). Determining when this unmistakable development of the theme of "remnant" and its direct association with the divine protection of Jerusalem took place is difficult. Although the 7th century is possible, this passage more likely reflects hopeful expectations that reemerged after the fall of Jerusalem (cf. also 10:12).

A directly comparable association between the remnant of Israel and a community of survivors in Jerusalem is found in 4:3 (cf. also the mention of the survivors, *pᵉlêṭâ,* of Israel in 4:2). This text must certainly date to a time after 587 B.C.E., as does the application to Jerusalem of the tradition of the few who survived the divine judgment on Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa. 1:9; cf. Rom. 9:29).

Isa. 11:11 and 16 further develop the positive expectations associated with the role of the remnant of Israel. Both verses — and v. 11 in particular — maintain that the remnant includes all the dispersed communities of Israel that have been driven into exile. These verses probably date to the 5th or even 4th century.

References to the remnant of Israel in exile also appear in 46:3 and 24:6,12. These late examples present the image of a surviving remnant after a catastrophic upheaval as a symbol of judgment upon the inhabitants of the entire earth. In the apocalyptic section Isa. 24–27, these late redactors of the book of Isaiah have made the experience of a global catastrophe during the end time the central theme of a radically apocalyptic es-

---

4. See II.4.
5. See in this regard H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 434-38.

chatology. Significantly the small number of those who survive this final global catastrophe are described as merely a remnant (of the human race).

3. *Jeremiah.* Although the book of Isaiah offers the most thorough development of the theme of the remnant of Israel, the book of Jeremiah also offers illuminating insights regarding this theme; these insights are all the more significant because the literary development of the theme took place within a much shorter period in this case. It is noteworthy that the originally negative connotations associated with the idea of the remnant acquired a more positive character in the aftermath of the 6th-century catastrophe. For the final Dtr redaction, the identity of this remnant with the community of exiles in Babylon was the main concern.

In a wholly negative prophecy concerning Judah's impending fate (before 598 B.C.E.), Jer. 6:9 explains that there will be no remnant (gleanings) in Israel. Jer. 8:3 then explains that the imminent decimation and exile of the population of Judah and Jerusalem will leave no remnant behind. Indeed, it says that the exiles will suffer such that they will prefer death to life. Then 15:9 similarly emphasizes that the remnant of Israel will be delivered over to the sword, and 11:23 announces to the people of Anathoth that they will have no remnant. Only after the first deportations of many leading citizens to Babylon in 598 does a more hopeful vision of Israel's future gradually emerge. In contrast to the popular contemporary assessment of the situation, 24:8-10 insists that those who remain behind in Jerusalem and view themselves as the fortunate survivors will in fact encounter an even more horrible judgment. By contrast, those who were dragged into exile will constitute the true remnant of Israel that will perhaps turn back to Yahweh in repentance (vv. 4-7).

After the further siege and fall of Jerusalem in 587, yet another group of those who had survived the catastrophe were deported to Babylon (39:9). A small group, including Jeremiah himself, remained behind in the country (40:6; 41:10,16). Jeremiah was summoned to pray for the welfare of this remnant (42:2,15,19; cf. 43:5), which 44:14 and 28 refer to as the "remnant of Judah." The historical addendum to the book describes it as the "poorest of the people" (52:15-16; cf. also 39:10). Concern for the future fate of this remnant was obviously of enormous urgency for the editors of the Jeremianic prophecies, which offered the generous assurance that there was indeed hope for the "remnant of Israel" (31:7). The book does make clear, however, that the Jeremianic assurance of hope for those who remain in Judah (42:10-17) does not apply for those who flee to Egypt (44:7,12).

Viewed on the whole, the book of Jeremiah thus exhibits a development in which the originally negative fate predicted for the remnant of Israel is altered by expressions of positive hope in the reestablishment of those who were carried off into Babylonian exile in 598 and 587. By contrast, absolutely no hope remains for those who fled to Egypt. Those who survived the catastrophe in Judah are similarly portrayed as those who have forfeited any right to be viewed as part of the loyal remnant. Only the exiles in Babylon have this role.[6] It was doubtless almost entirely at the initiative of the

6. See K.-F. Pohlmann, *Die Ferne Gottes. Studien zum Jeremiabuch. BZAW* 179 (1989); Seitz, 203ff.

redactors that the idea of the remnant acquired such extraordinary significance in the book of Jeremiah, who imbued this idea with unequivocally positive connotations in the form of religious loyalty and the right to control the land of Israel. What is noteworthy, however, is that they identified this remnant exclusively with the community of exiles in Babylon, and the enumeration of these deportations in 52:28-30 serves to focus attention on precisely this community. Other survivors from the earlier kingdoms of Israel and Judah are simply ignored despite the forceful words of consolation and hope directed to them in 30:10-11; 31:7-9,10-14.

4. *Ezekiel.* The development in Ezekiel is remarkably similar to that in Jeremiah. One major difference is probably that the change of perspective on the fate of the survivors of 598 and 587 derives from the hand of the prophet himself. In Ezk. 6:12 (dating prior to 587) the prophet proclaims to the inhabitants of Judah that they will have no remnant to speak of: "Those far off shall die of pestilence; those nearby shall fall by the sword; and any who are left and are spared shall die of famine." The oracles of doom in 5:10 and 17:21 similarly offer little hope for those who survive in Judah after the Babylonian forces overrun Jerusalem's resistance. One puzzling and as yet unresolved item is the symbolic portrayal of some inhabitants of Judah in 9:4 who have marks on their foreheads as a sign of grief at the sins of Jerusalem. The text does not explain who these chosen ones are or what their fate is.

After the catastrophic events of 587, we encounter a complete rejection of any claims on the part of the surviving inhabitants of Jerusalem that they thus constitute the remnant (33:23-29). The possibility is wholly excluded that any of the Judeans or Jerusalemites who survived those events might constitute a loyal community from which the nation itself my reemerge. Like the book of Jeremiah, the book of Ezekiel also refers exclusively to the Babylonian exiles as the basis for the believing remnant (cf. esp. Ezk. 11:16, which emphasizes God's special providence with regard to this group). The sayings in Ezk. 36:2-15,16-21,22-36 show that hope arose in which those beyond the immediate boundaries of the exiled Babylonian community might participate during the period when Israel was reestablished. The prophet's words are directed to the mountains of Israel and concern the surrounding peoples. One main concern of these later editors of the Ezekelian material was to expand the notion of the remnant, which initially is localized in Babylon, ultimately to include the Jews of many different communities living "among the nations." The promise is that they will be cleansed from the impurity that has accrued while they lived among the nations and that they will ultimately be led back home (36:33-38).

5. *Minor Prophets.* The prophetic collection from various periods known as the Minor Prophets shows a development of the understanding of the remnant of Israel quite similar to that found in the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Unlike the development in latter two books, however, this one strongly suggests that a politically active postexilic remnant was resident in Jerusalem.

There is no clear understanding of a national remnant of Israel in Hosea. In the book of Joel future hope for the community begins with the expectation of a national revival

(Joel 2:12ff.). This understanding is narrowed later such that the renewed community is restricted to Judah and Jerusalem (4:1,6,20[3:1,6,20]), a position quite commensurate with the postexilic understanding that this territory represents the divinely acknowledged remnant of the former Israel.

Although in the 8th century Am. 5:15 refers to the "remnant of Joseph" as the possible recipient of Yahweh's grace, the impression that Israel has already experienced judgment is probably to be understood as a reference to territorial losses Israel already suffered prior to the Assyrian intrusion. The image of destruction threatening Samaria in the portrayal of Am. 3:12 is extremely severe. Here the remnant, which is compared to the paltry carcass scraps a lion leaves behind after devouring a sheep, is more likely confirming a horrible catastrophe than symbolizing hope and renewal. In Am. 5:3 the vb. *šā'ar* hiphil announces that the population of Israelite cities threatened by destruction will be reduced to a tenth. Again it is the severity of judgment rather than a basis for hope that comes to expression in this warning. Am. 9:11-12 expresses general hope in the future restoration of Israel; the verse dates to the exilic or postexilic period and is more likely articulating the hope in a complete return to national existence under a monarchy than hope in a combative remnant subject to foreign political authority, as also clearly expressed in the assurance that Israel will possess "the remnant of Edom."

The significance of the references to the remnant *(šeʾērîṯ)* of Israel in the book of Micah is that they reflect a postexilic situation. As already in Joel, here the claims of a Jewish community in Jerusalem to represent the true remnant of Israel begin to acquire great significance. At the same time, those Jews living "dispersed among the nations" claim equal status as rightful heirs of the divine promises to the fathers.

The promise of Mic. 2:12 that Yahweh will gather together the remnant of Israel like sheep in a fold probably represents a postexilic addendum whose purpose is to weaken the preceding message of judgment to Jerusalem (vv. 1-5,6-11). The assurance that Yahweh will reestablish Israel as a unity refers to Jews living dispersed among the nations and views them as part of that remnant.

Mic. 4:7 draws attention to the tension between the party enjoying authority in Jerusalem (in the 5th century B.C.E.?) and those who are excluded. The unusual promise that Yahweh will make the lame *(ṣōlēʿâ)* a remnant probably alludes to the situation of the first Israelite conquest of Jerusalem (2 S. 5:6; cf. Isa. 33:23). Mic. 4:7 emphatically asserts that membership in this remnant requires total subordination to the spiritual authority of Jerusalem (cf. also Isa. 37:32). Mic. 5:7-8(8-9) also makes clear that the reference is both to a remnant in Judah and to a more heterogeneous and dispersed remnant among the nations, though this situation is described only vaguely. Mic. 5:7a(8a) seems to refer to a remnant living in Judah "surrounded by many peoples"; by contrast, the same verse envisions the "remnant of Jacob" "among the nations." The expression "remnant of his [Yahweh's] possession" in Mic. 7:8(9) refers anew to this community of surviving Jews representing the spiritual continuity with earlier Israel.

Zeph. 2:7 must be considered postexilic, dating probably to the 5th century B.C.E. It offers the assurance that the "remnant of the house of Judah" will possess the Philistine territory. Given the emphatic importance of the remnant in Jerusalem attested in some passages in Isaiah and Micah, it is rather surprising to hear Zeph. 3:12 maintain that

those who dwell in Jerusalem (on the holy mountain of Yahweh) will be a humble and lowly people whose strength and spiritual authority will reside in their integrity and honesty (3:13). To that end, Yahweh will allegedly cut out "every remnant of Baal" from Jerusalem (1:4).

Awareness of the politically weakened and economically impoverished Jews who settled in Jerusalem toward the end of the 6th century B.C.E. is clearly evident in Haggai and Zechariah. Hag. 2:3 refers to "those left among you" who beheld the glory of Jerusalem before its destruction in 587, whom 1:12 and 14 call the "remnant of the people" (= the entire community of returnees from the exile) without specifically addressing the issue that an even larger remnant was still lingering dispersed among the nations (cf. also 2:2). The predominance of remnant terminology in Haggai and Zechariah shows that at the end of the 6th century it had become an extremely relevant political and religious expression (cf. Zech. 8:6,11,12).[7] This remnant is described as living in Jerusalem (8:2ff.), as having been brought there from many lands in the east and the west, and as having become prosperous there (v. 12).

6. *Chronicler's History.* For the purposes of this present investigation, the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah can be examined as a single redactional unity. What is significant here is the way these books try to redefine Israel as a nation.[8]

Remnant terminology rarely occurs in 1 and 2 Chronicles. 1 Ch. 13:2 alludes to the "kindred who remain in all the land of Israel" during the time when David acceded to the throne. The verse seems to refer to a large but not more closely defined region loosely associated with Israel.[9] 2 Ch. 21:17 refers to the plundering of the family and possessions of Joram by the Philistines, the Arabs, and the Ethiopians, leaving only Jehoahaz unscathed. 2 Ch. 30:6 describes an appeal delivered by messengers sent by Hezekiah to the entire remnant of the northern kingdom who had survived the Assyrian plundering (cf. also 34:9,21, which refer to those who survived the period of Assyrian control over Israel during the time of Josiah).

The situation emerging after the Babylonians' destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of many inhabitants to Babylon is described as having made possible the rise of the dispersed remnant. Ezra 1:4, part of what is known as the Edict of Cyrus, refers to individual survivors, to every person, regardless of where that person may live, whereas 3:8 refers to the community of those survivors *(šᵉ'ār)* who returned to Jerusalem. In any event, 9:8, a prayer ascribed to Ezra, views the existence of a remnant living in Jerusalem *(pᵉlêṭâ)* as the basis for future hope (cf. also v. 15).

Neh. 1:2-3 refers explicitly to the survivors in Jerusalem who escaped deportation and exile and views them as part of the true Israel. Neh. 10:29(28) describes a surviving community in Jerusalem as a remnant, while 11:1 and 20 refer to a broader community including priests and Levites in Judean cities outside Jerusalem.

---

7. See H. W. Wolff, *Haggai. CC* (Eng. trans. 1988), 51-52.
8. See Williamson, *Israel,* 87ff.
9. See ibid., 124.

In general the books of Ezra and Nehemiah use the remnant terminology in a way that significantly develops its use in the books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. These prophets envision a remnant essentially identical with the exilic community that was deported to Babylon, while Ezra and Nehemiah are visibly concerned with balancing the claims of the exiles with those of the remnant in Judah and Jerusalem. Toward the end of the 5th century B.C.E., it became necessary to forge closer ties and come to some agreement with regard to religious practices between Jews living in Jerusalem and Judah and those living in other parts of the Persian Empire. The leadership role of a small, strictly organized community of exiled Jews living in Babylon no longer adequately addressed the differing political and religious needs of Jews living in more broadly dispersed regions. One primary object of Jewish eschatological hope was that the true remnant of Israel had been directed by God to settle in Jerusalem and that the divine summons would order all other survivors of Israel to return there as well. In the meantime, though, it had become important that this prophetic-eschatological hope not be permitted to undermine the claims of the broader community of Jews living in the Diaspora in distant parts of the Persian Empire.

The breadth and undefined political structure attaching to the notion of a remnant *(šᵉ'ērîṯ, pᵉlêṭâ)* made it a useful instrument within a complex historical situation that for Israel had been created by the social and political collapse of the small kingdom of Judah after the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 and that was also influenced by the strong leadership claims raised by a significant group of exiles in Babylon who maintained their connections with Judah (Jer. 29). That the term "remnant" lacked any territorial or political definition enabled it to encompass extremely complex matters without at the same time negating the expectation that Israel might be restored with full national status.

The term "remnant" became a category of primarily religious import supplied by its use in prophetic oracles of woe and comfort. Originally a term expressing the notion of threat and evoking the destruction of communities, it then acquired almost the opposite meaning, defining "survivors" in the hopeful sense that they might constitute the basis of a restored nation. In this way it also acquired the meaning "legitimate heirs" of the religious and national traditions of Israel, at the same time serving to strengthen hope in Israel's possible national restoration. While allowing ample space for alteration of the forms of the social and religious life of the communities to which it was applied, it also strongly emphasized the idea of religious legitimation. Its specific development occurred during the Persian period, when the initial expectations that the Israelite nation might be restored after 538 first encountered difficulties and were ultimately dashed. The term later exerted a considerable influence on the formation of sectarian forms of Judaism during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

7. *LXX and Qumran.* The LXX translates the various forms of *šā'ar* with the vbs. *leípein* and *kataleípein.* The corresponding substantives are *loipós* and *katáloipos.*

One can hardly doubt that the Qumran community viewed itself as the legitimate central body of the true remnant of Israel, something expressed in 1QM 14:8-9 (cf. also 1QH 6:8,32; CD 1:4; 1QM 13:8; 4QFlor 2:2 in the interpretation of Ps. 2:1-2). By con-

trast, those who deviate from the way and loathe the law and covenant will be delivered over to judgment and to the sword with no hope of escape such that no remnant will remain (cf. 1QS 4:14; 5:13; CD 2:6; 19:10,13; 1QH 6:32; 7:22; 1QM 1:6 par. 4:2; 14:5 par. 4Q286 10, II, 10). During this period, reference to the remnant acquired a strongly partisan and sectarian meaning serving to strengthen the claims of particular splinter groups and circles within the Jewish community. The strong emphasis on obedience to the Torah and on the necessity of entering into the full community of the Qumran settlement indicates an almost exclusively religious understanding of the "remnant." All the earlier political and territorial characteristics of the concept seem to have been abandoned (though cf. the hierarchy priest-elders-people in 1QS 2:6; 1QM 2:11; 11:15).

The term appears without any particular theological connotations in 11QT 21:4; 58:14; 61:11.

In the emerging Christian church, the term also acquired enormous importance within a religiously defined framework comparable to that in Qumran (cf. Rom. 11:5).

Clements

שָׁבָה *šāḇâ;* שְׁבִי *šᵉḇî;* שִׁבְיָה *šiḇyâ;* שָׁבִי *šāḇî;* שְׁבִית *šᵉḇîṯ*

Contents: I. Meaning and Occurrences. II. Historical and Narrative Texts: 1. Prisoners of War; 2. Spoils; 3. Social Status of Prisoners of War. III. Prisoners of War in the Yahweh Wars. IV. Prophetic Traditions: War Captivity = The Babylonian Exile: 1. Oracles of Doom; 2. Oracles of Promise: a. Liberation from Captivity = Redemption *(gʾl);* b. Capturing Israel's Enemies; c. Liberation from Captivity and Repentance; Deuteronomistic Discourse in 1 K. 8. V. "Captivity" in Ezra and Nehemiah. VI. Qumran.

I. Meaning and Occurrences. The semantic field of the root *šbh* in the Semitic languages is easily located. The meaning of the verbal forms is consistently "make prison-

---

šāḇâ. E. Baumann, "שׁוב שׁבות. Eine exegetische Untersuchung," *ZAW* 47 (1929) 17-44; F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, 1973); E. L. Dietrich, שׁוב שׁבות. *Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten. BZAW* 40 (1925); S. Iwry, "Was There a Migration to Damascus? The Problem of שׁבי ישראל," *ErIsr* 9 (1969) 80-88; A. S. Kapelrud, *The Question of Authorship in the Ezra-Narrative. SNVAO* Historisk-Filosofisk Klasse II/1 (Oslo, 1944); P. D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel. HSM* 5 (1973); D. Pardee, "A Restudy of the Commentary on Psalm 37 from Qumran Cave 4," *RevQ* 8 (1972/75) 163-94, esp. 182-83; R. E. Price, "A Lexicographical Study of *glh, šbh,* and *šwb* in Reference to Exile in the Tanach" (diss., Duke, 1977); G. von Rad, *Holy War in Ancient Israel* (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1991); A. Schoors, "שׁבי and גלות in Is 40–55. Historical Background," *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies* 5 (Jerusalem, 1969), 90-101; R. L. Smith, "The Shape of Theology in the Book of Malachi," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 30 (1987) 42-47; E. Szlechter, "Effets de la captivité en droit assyro-babylonien," *RA* 57 (1963) 181-92; 58 (1964) 23-35.

ers of war, lead into war captivity," and the derived substantival forms mean "prisoner of war" or "captivity"; cf. Ugar. *šby;* also *šbm,* "gag (someone)"; Aram. *šby;* OSA (Sab.) *sby.*[1] The same meanings are found in later Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic. In other Old South Arabic dialects, related *sb'* means to "wage war."[2] By contrast, the association with doubtful Akk. *šabû,* "oppress, overwhelm,"[3] is uncertain. On the Moabite Mesha inscription, some scholars find the root *šbh* (instead of *šwb*) behind the verb form *w'šb* in l. 12: "I carried off from there Arel,"[4] though few scholars concur with this understanding.[5] One particular stylistic figure occurs several times in Aramaic texts, namely, the verb with an inner object from the same root. The same stylistic figure also occurs in biblical texts.

The root occurs about 100 times in the OT, split approximately between verb and noun forms. The LXX translates these terms almost exclusively with *aichmalōsía, aichmalōteúein,* etc.

II. Historical and Narrative Texts.

1. *Prisoners of War.* In the OT the simple, basic meaning comes most clearly to expression in historical and narrative texts. The account of the Amalekite assault on Ziklag in 1 S. 30 probably represents an originally independent tradition[6] recounting how the Amalekites burned the city to the ground, "taking captive the women and all who were in it, both small and great," including both of David's wives (vv. 2,3,5; *šbh* qal and niphal).[7] In the accounts of the land conquest, the Israelite tribes are attacked by the Canaanite king of Arad, who takes some of the Israelites as prisoners of war (Nu. 21:1; *šbh* qal with *šᵉḇî* as inner obj.). By contrast, the Israelites themselves take prisoners of war in their battles with the Midianites, including women and small children (Nu. 31:9; *šbh* qal; v. 12: *šᵉḇî*). In the patriarchal stories Lot is led away as a prisoner of war (Gen. 14:14; *šbh* niphal), and Laban compares Jacob's flight with the women to the carrying away of prisoners of war ("like captives of the sword," Gen. 31:26; *šbh* qal pass. ptcp.).

Texts dealing with later periods frequently mention prisoners of war, including the stories of the Aramean wars (2 K. 6:22), the account of Amaziah's war against the Edomites (2 Ch. 25:12), then several times in the Chronicler's account of the quarrels between Judah and Israel under Ahaz (2 Ch. 28:8,11,13-15,17), and finally in the ac-

---

1. For Ugaritic: *KTU* 1.2, IV, 29-30; cf. *WUS,* no. 2574; according to *CML*², 158, also *šb* in *KTU* 1.3, III, 40; 1.83, 8; *WUS,* no. 2576; for Aramaic: *KAI* 215.8; 233.15-16; *AP* 71.14; cf. *DNSI,* II, 1100-1101; also 1QapGen *šb', šby,* 21:34–22:25 passim; cf. J. A. Fitzmyer and D. J. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts. BietOr* 34 (1978), 338; for Old South Arabic: Biella, 325-26.

2. ContiRossini, 193.

3. F. Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1896), 637.

4. *KAI* 181; H. Winckler, *Geschichte Israels,* I (Leipzig, 1895), 68; cf. *ANET,* 320b.

5. Though cf. T. C. Vriezen and J. H. Hospers, *Palestine Inscriptions* (Leiden, 1951), 20; G. A. Cooke, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1903), 11.

6. J. H. Grønbæk, *Die Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids* (Copenhagen, 1971), 201.

7. See Baumann, 37.

counts of Ishmael at Mizpah (Jer. 41:10; v. 16 might be corrected to a form of *šbh*). In describing the actions of the high powers, authors often mention their custom of taking and deporting captives (Arameans and Assyrians in 2 Ch. 28:5; 29:9; probably also in Am. 9:4: *hlk* + *baššᵉḇî*; Babylonians in Ps. 137:3; Hab. 1:9; Antiochus Epiphanes in Dnl. 11:33).

2. *Spoils.* As already seen, words from the root *šbh* generally refer to people. Not infrequently, however, they also refer to livestock, goods, and so on as "prisoners of war" or "spoils of war." In the previously mentioned narrative of the war against the Midianites, Yahweh orders an inventory of the "booty captured, both human and animal" (Nu. 31:26; *malqôaḥ haššᵉḇî*), and after the slaughter at Shechem Simeon and Levi take captive all possessions of the Shechemites as well as their women and children (Gen. 34:29). Similar remarks in other accounts of military campaigns include 1 Ch. 5:21; 2 Ch. 14:14(Eng. 15); 21:17; Am. 4:10; Ob. 11; cf. Ex. 22:9, where liability laws presuppose that livestock can also be taken "captive" in times of war).

Several noteworthy passages recount how the gods or the symbols of the gods of the defeated people are taken away as prisoners. Ps. 78:61 describes the Philistine plunder of the ark of the covenant with the words *wayyittēn laššᵉḇî 'uzzô,* "he [Yahweh] delivered his power to captivity." Jeremiah predicts that Nebuchadnezzar will burn down the temples of Egypt's gods and "carry them away captive," i.e., probably the gods themselves (Jer. 43:12). Deutero-Isaiah metaphorically describes the fall of Babylon as the capture and removal of the gods Bel and Nebo (Isa. 46:2; *hlk baššᵉḇî*), and in the book of Daniel the angel says that the Ptolemies will carry off the idols of the Seleucids to Egypt as booty (Dnl. 11:8).

With this expansion of the term "prisoner of war," the expression more or less acquires the meaning "(take) spoils of war." Accordingly, the root *šbh* also frequently appears alongside lexemes meaning "plunder," "booty," etc., e.g., in Gen. 34:29 *(bzz);* Nu. 31:9,32 *(bzz);* 31:11-12 *(šll);* Isa. 49:24-25 *(malqôaḥ);* Jer. 30:16 *(bzz);* Dnl. 11:33 (→ בזז *bzz*); 2 Ch. 28:8 (*šll* and *bzz*). By contrast, the terms "prisoners of war" and "banned goods" *(ḥērem),* of course, are never associated with the root, since by definition anything devoted to the ban was killed rather than carried off captive.[8] According to the account of the war against the Midianites in Nu. 31, all the Midianite men were killed, while the women and children were taken away as captives; in this connection the authors avoid the root *ḥrm.*

3. *Social Status of Prisoners of War.* The account just mentioned (Nu. 31) provides some insight into the social status of prisoners of war. The women and children who were allowed to survive after the battle subsequently receive different treatment. To prevent any new generation of Midianites from emerging, the boys and every woman "who has known a man" and is perhaps pregnant are to be killed. Only the virgin Midianite women are allowed to live. Such a woman is allowed to marry an Israelite af-

8. See Miller, 157.

ter completing the same purification rites as do returning soldiers (Nu. 31:13-20; *šᵉḇî*, v. 19). The more humane laws of Deuteronomy apparently presuppose that even captive women who "have known a man" in their homeland can marry an Israelite after having gone through a full menstrual period (this notion probably underlies the justification of a one-month waiting period with reference to the performance of certain mourning rites) (Dt. 21:10-14; *šbh* qal; *šᵉḇî* and *šiḇyâ;* construction with inner obj. in v. 10). Ex. 12:29 and 2 K. 5:2 (*šᵉḇî* and *šbh* qal) show that during times of war, captive women were also kept as slaves or at least occupied an extremely low status in society. Akkadian laws regarding prisoners of war aim above all at protecting the marriage and possessions of prisoners of war during their absence (cf. Szlechter).

III. Prisoners of War in the Yahweh Wars. Yahweh himself appears as a warrior in several OT texts whose strongly mythological features make it difficult to distinguish between celestial and earthly wars.[9] Such texts occasionally mention prisoners of war. Ps. 68 consists in part of fragments from old war or victory hymns.[10] Here Yahweh is directly addressed, and his victory procession goes from Sinai to Zion, with the cultic community (the heavenly or earthly hosts?) saying: "You ascended the high mount, leading captives in your train, and receiving gifts from/of people" (v. 19[18]; the meaning of the parallel verse is actually "gifts consisting of people"). In the Song of Moses (Dt. 32), Yahweh himself describes his campaign of vengeance against the enemies; his sword "devours the flesh with the blood of the slain and the captives" (v. 42). The Song of Deborah (Jgs. 5) summons Barak: "Arise, Barak, lead away your captives, O son of Abinoam!" (v. 12). The speaker here, as in v. 23, could be the angel of Yahweh, and the song in general is a classic example of the previously mentioned ambiguity in which heavenly and earthly war is viewed within the same perspective. The summons *qûm bārāq* recalls the summons to Yahweh to display his power (Ps. 7:7[6]; 44:24,27[23,26]; Isa. 51:9).[11] The same notion that Yahweh himself leads Israel's wars also underlies the prophetic and Dtr passages in the discussions below.

IV. Prophetic Traditions: War Captivity = The Babylonian Exile. The prophetic traditions generally speak quite concretely about war captivity with respect to the Babylonian exile in the 6th century, albeit with two exceptions. In a passage where Isaiah is warning against a Judean alliance with Egypt, he tells his listeners of the consequences: the Assyrians will one day lead the Egyptians away into captivity, thus dashing Judah's hopes (Isa. 20:4; *šᵉḇî* par. *gālûṯ*). This statement probably dates to the period of the Philistine rebellion against the Assyrians ca. 712.[12] The book of Nahum, however, provides a retrospective of the Assyrian attack on Egypt in the 7th century. Here too the Egyptians are taken away into captivity (Nah. 3:10).

Apart from these two passages, however, the prophets' references are to the Babylo-

9. Cf. Cross, 91-111; Miller, 65-165.
10. See Miller, 103, 230-31.
11. Cf. Miller, 87-102; von Rad, 56-59.
12. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. trans. 1997), 288-91.

nian exile, which can be viewed straightaway as "the captivity." Later OT texts use the expression "the captivity" as a neutral, almost technical reference to the exile or to the exilic community. Among the prophets, however, reference to the exile as "captivity" exhibits a completely different theological coloring in that it normally occurs in connection with oracles of doom or promise.

1. *Oracles of Doom.* Jeremiah often vacillates between anger and sorrow when predicting the fate of his people. In ch. 13 both emotions come to expression in the metaphor "Yahweh's flock has been taken captive" (v. 17; *šbh* niphal). The notion of danger comes more directly to expression when he answers the question of what will happen to the people with the following words: "Those destined for pestilence, to pestilence, and those destined for the sword, to the sword; those destined for captivity, to captivity" (15:2; *šᵉḇî*). He directs the same threat against Egypt in 43:11; cf. Dt. 28:41, where sons and daughters "shall go into captivity."

A more concrete situation arises when the prophets direct their oracles against individuals. The oracles against the royal family in Jerusalem (Jer. 22) contain a statement directed against a woman, probably personified Jerusalem, saying that her lovers will be crushed (v. 20), but also that "your lovers shall go into captivity" (v. 22; *hālaḵ baššᵉḇî*). The threat in 20:1-6, however, is unequivocally directed against a person. The priest Pashhur puts Jeremiah in stocks. After being released, Jeremiah curses Pashhur, predicting in v. 6 that Pashhur and his family will be deported to Babylon: "And you, Pashhur, and all who live in your house, shall go into captivity *(hālaḵ baššᵉḇî)";* this oracle recalls Am. 7:17.

Ezekiel's oracles of judgment include Ezk. 12:11 predicting the deportation of the Israelites to Babylon: "they shall go into exile, into captivity" (*hālaḵ* + *baggôlâ baššᵉḇî;* v. 13 mentions Babylon).

2. *Oracles of Promise.* In keeping with the contrast between judgment and promise typical of the prophetic writings, predictions of captivity and exile are countered by predictions of liberation from captivity. Such promises refer either directly to the return of the Judeans or indirectly to the capture of Israel's enemies and the resulting liberation of the Judeans.

a. *Liberation from Captivity = Redemption (g'l).* References to the captivity of the Judeans and to their enslavement among foreigners invoke a legal issue prompting the use of the vb. → גאל *gā'al,* "redeem," in connection with the motif of liberation from captivity. Lev. 25:47-54 provides the legal regulations affecting the redemption or purchase of freedom for an Israelite who has to serve as a foreigner's slave. If Israel is the captive slave, Yahweh is then the party who will step in as redeemer.

It is especially Deutero-Isaiah who uses the term "redemption" theologically in reference to the situation of the exiles. In a disputation typical of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 49:24ff.; *šᵉḇî* par. *malqôaḥ*), the author desperately asks whether the liberation of the Judeans from exile is even possible: "Can the prey be taken from the mighty, or the captives of a tyrant be rescued?" The Lord's answer is: "Even the captives of the mighty shall be taken, and the prey of the tyrant be rescued; for I will contend with

those who contend with you" (v. 25);[13] "then all flesh shall know that I am Yahweh your Savior, and your Redeemer, the Mighty One of Jacob" (v. 26). In one oracle of salvation, Deutero-Isaiah speaks to Jerusalem as the representative of the Judeans, addressing the city as a woman and summoning her to "loose the bonds from your neck, O captive daughter Zion" (52:2), continuing in the following verse, "you shall be redeemed without money."

The prophecies against Babylon in Jer. 50–51 (probably post-Jeremianic)[14] say that the Babylonians will keep the Israelites and Judeans and will not release them (50:33). Yahweh their redeemer, however, is strong and intends to conduct their legal matters. The same juxtaposition of captivity and redemption is found in Ps. 106, which views the exodus liberation from Egypt as redemption (v. 10). The retrospective at the end of the psalm on Israel's history, which has a Dtr sound to it, summarizes the tribulations of the early period, which end with exile and dispersion, as "captivity" (v. 46; cf. the same formulation in 2 Ch. 30:9). The poem in Isa. 61 probably dates to the same late period as does this psalm, even though it seems to echo Deutero-Isaiah. The messenger, speaking in Yahweh's name, proclaims freedom to the captives — the exiles or the Jews in the Diaspora (v. 1). Although the root *g'l* does not appear here, the word "freedom" *(d^erôr)* comes from the same legal context as *g'l* (cf. Lev. 25:10; Jer. 34:8,15,17).

b. *Capturing Israel's Enemies.* The indirect manner of expression in which the capture of Israel's enemies implies the liberation of the Israelites themselves is often expressed through wordplay. In the oracle against Babylon in Isa. 13–14 from the later exilic period,[15] a later addendum in 14:1-2 says that if Yahweh has compassion on Israel, the earlier enemies will lead Israel home and will serve Israel as slaves, i.e., "they [the Israelites] will take captive those who were their captors" (v. 2; accepting the textual emendation according to the Pesh. in Jgs. 5:12 [cf. *BHS*], one suspects that the Isaianic passage is dependent on that in Judges[16]). The same wordplay appears in a more mutilated form in Jer. 30:16: "all who devour you shall be devoured, and all your foes, every one of them, shall go into captivity *(ṣārayiḵ . . . baššᵉḇî yēlēḵû);* those who plunder you shall be plundered" (cf. *'ereṣ šiḇyām,* "the land of their captivity," v. 10).

This latter expression (Jer. 30:10) recurs in 46:27 in a different context. In Jer. 30 it remains unclear whether Assyria or Babylon is the enemy. By contrast, in ch. 46 the opinion of the redactor is likely that the "land of their captivity" is Egypt, whose own fate is described in the remaining part of the chapter. When Israel returns home, Egypt will be destroyed.

The book of Ezekiel states even more directly that the Egyptians will perish. When the Babylonians attack Egypt, the young men will fall, and the young women will go into captivity (Ezk. 30:17,18; both verses probably refer to the young women).[17] A textual emendation *(BHS)* supported by the LXX makes 32:9 into a reference to the depor-

---

13. → ריב *rîḇ*.
14. See W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 297-99.
15. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 16-17; on the addendum: ibid., 33-34.
16. See O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 25-26.
17. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 126-28.

tation of the Egyptians into captivity (*šeḇer* being changed to *šᵉḇî*).[18] Both these passages from Ezekiel refer to events during the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

The great Moab oracle in Jer. 48 is a mosaic of earlier and later oracles against Moab. At the end of the chapter, an ancient Israelite victory song over King Sihon of Heshbon is cited that occurs in Nu. 21 in connection with the land conquest. The statements, however, are not completely identical. One of the striking differences emerges precisely in connection with captives. Nu. 21:29 is an oracle of woe over Moab that appropriately identifies the people with their national god Chemosh and predicts their fall. It then says, "he [Chemosh] made his sons fugitives, and his daughters captives, to an Amorite king, Sihon." The version of the oracle that made its way into the book of Jeremiah, after a similar introduction, reads: "for your sons have been taken captive, and your daughters into captivity" (Jer. 48:46). The prophetic tradition tried to eliminate from the earlier citation the impression that the pagan god Chemosh initiated the judgment on Moab and added v. 47 (which is absent, of course, in Numbers) to indicate unequivocally that Yahweh is the only Lord over the fate of Moab.

c. *Liberation from Captivity and Repentance; Deuteronomistic Discourse in 1 K. 8.* This alteration of an earlier tradition within a more recent prophetic context is typical. The future of Israel and the future of other nations are in Yahweh's hands, i.e., whether they are taken away into or are liberated from captivity. This basic prophetic position does not, however, prevent the authors from viewing Israel's own repentance as a condition for their return from exile. This idea of repentance only rarely comes to expression in connection with statements about captivity. Ezekiel alludes to it, speaking about the survivors who are captive among the nations (Ezk. 6:9), where they will think of Yahweh and know that he is the Lord, and will understand why he allowed such misfortune to befall them.

The typical Dtr speech of Solomon at the temple dedication in Jerusalem (1 K. 8) more clearly develops this connection between repentance and liberation, portraying various situations of distress. Israel experiences Yahweh's help when it turns toward the temple in prayer, and when the Israelites have sinned, have been punished by Yahweh with war, and "they are carried away captive to the land of the enemy" (v. 46). The ensuing verses contain a series of sophisticated wordplays using *šbh* (qal and niphal), *šwb,* and *yšb.* If in repentance they turn to the temple, Yahweh will maintain their cause and free them from captivity (vv. 49-50; cf. the par. text 2 Ch. 6:36-39 with slight variations).

These wordplays with *šbh* and *šûḇ* resemble the problems with the expression *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* in which the element *šᵉḇûṯ* is normally derived from the root *šwb* even though in certain passage a mingling with *šᵉḇîṯ,* "captivity," arises. Baumann suspects that *šᵉḇûṯ* refers to an ethical-juridical term in the sense of "imprisonment for debt" and suggests that the word thus derives from *šbh.*[19] Only secondarily was *šᵉḇûṯ* then applied to the exile.[20]

---

18. See ibid., 156, 160-61.

19. Baumann, 42-43.

20. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1386b; Dietrich, 30-32; J. A. Soggin, "שׁוּב *šûb* to return," *TLOT,* III, 1312-17; → שְׁבוּת/שְׁבִית; → שׁוּב; J. M. Bracke, "*šûb šᵉbût:* A Reappraisal," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 233-44, esp. 233-34.

V. "Captivity" in Ezra and Nehemiah. In some later texts words such as "capture" and "captivity" almost become technical terms for the Babylonian exile and are used almost without theological connotations. The question of guilt is then almost never raised, contrary to what was virtually always the case in the prophets. One exception involves a couple of retrospectives on the events leading up to the exile. Lamentations twice mentions that because of the people's sin, the children of Jerusalem had to go into captivity (Lam. 1:5,18). In his great prayer, Ezra looks back at Israel's history and confesses that its misdeeds since the days of the fathers resulted in the people being taken into captivity (Ezra 9:7).

Although Neh. 1:2-3 refers to the Judeans who remained in the land after 587 as "those who escaped the captivity," the more common expression in Ezra and Nehemiah is the fixed expression "those who returned from captivity." The superscription of the long list of returning Jews mentions "those who came up from the captivity of exile" (Ezra 2:1, *hā'ōlîm miššᵉḇî haggôlâ*). During the temple construction after the return, the Levites and priests are joined by "all who had come to Jerusalem from the captivity" (3:8). Upon Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem, he delivers the returned temple utensils, and "those who had come from captivity, the sons of the exile," make an offering (8:35, *habbā'îm mēhaššᵉḇî bᵉnê-haggôlâ*). Finally — and quite typically — the entire Jerusalem cultic community is called "all the assembly of those who had returned from the captivity." After Ezra reads the law, the entire community builds tabernacles and celebrates the Feast of Tabernacles (Neh. 8:17).[21]

Am. 4:10 describes earlier scourges that Israel had to endure in which the young men were killed and the horses led off into captivity. Although this juxtaposition is not impossible, it fits poorly in the present context of pestilence and death. The text has doubtless been edited, and the reference to the horses needs to be altered or eliminated.[22] The two passages Mic. 2:4 and 8 are extremely questionable; although interpreters often emend to forms of *šbh* (cf. *BHS*), these attempts are not persuasive.[23]

VI. Qumran. The root *šbh* occurs rarely in early Jewish texts. CD 14:12ff. presents regulations for the care of the poor and needy within the Qumran community. Those needing such aid include the man "taken captive by a foreign people" (l. 15, *šbh* niphal). The War Scroll is more interesting in this regard. After the portrayals of how the Lord himself and his hosts will participate in the great war of the end time, the authors present a magnificent victory song that seems like a mosaic of OT allusions to, among other things, texts portraying Yahweh as a warrior (Dt. 32; Jgs. 5; Ps. 68).[24] Whereas the Song of Deborah issues the summons, "Arise, Barak, lead away your captives!" 1QM 12:10 addresses Yahweh with the words, "Rise up, O Hero! Lead off your

---

21. See Kapelrud, 57-58, 90.
22. See W. Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 169-71.
23. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 52-53, 57-58; H. W. Wolff, *Micah. CC* (Eng. trans. 1990), 70-71. On the *Q-K* forms in Ps. 85:2(1); 126:4; Ezk. 16:53; Zeph. 2:7, see Dietrich, 28-32; → שְׁבוּת/שְׁבִית; → שׁוּב.
24. See III above.

captives, O Glorious One!" (*šbh* with *šᵉḇî* as the internal obj.). Nah. 3:1-3 and 10 refer to the enemies of the community ("Manasseh," 4QpNah 4:3) whose rule will come to an end and all of whom will be led off into captivity (2:5; 4:4). By contrast, 4QpHos[a] 1:16 speaks positively about the return from captivity while explicating Hos. 2:9b. 11QT 63:10-13 (ter) corresponds to the Dtn law concerning marriage to a female prisoner of war (Dt. 21:10-14).

Otzen

שְׁבוּת/שְׁבִית *šᵉḇûṯ/šᵉḇîṯ;* שׁוּב שְׁבוּת/שְׁבִית *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ/šᵉḇîṯ;* שׁוּב שִׁיבַת *šûḇ šîḇaṯ*

Contents: I. 1. Occurrences; 2. Derivation and Meaning; 3. Versions. II. OT: 1. General Considerations; 2. Hiphil; 3. Qal; 4. Other Passages with *šûḇ;* 5. Aramaic. III. 1. Targum of Job; 2. Qumran.

šᵉḇûṯ/šᵉḇîṯ. J. Barth, "Vergleichende Studien I. Über bilaterale Nomina," *ZDMG* 41 (1887) 603-41, esp. 618-20; E. Baumann, "שׁוּב שבות. Eine exegetische Untersuchung," *ZAW* 47 (1929) 17-44; M. Ben-Yashar, *"šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ," FS M. Breuer* (forthcoming); F. Böttcher, *Neue exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese zum AT,* I (Leipzig, 1863), esp. 65-66 (no. 109); R. Borger, "Zu שׁוב שבו/ית," *ZAW* 66 (1954) 315-16; J. M. Bracke, "*šûḇ šᵉḇût:* A Reappraisal," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 233-44; H. Cazelles, "L'expression *šubh šebhut* viendrait-elle de l'accadien d'Asarhaddon?" *GLECS* 9 (1961) 57-60; E. L. Dietrich, שׁוּב שבות. *Die endzeitliche Wiederherstellung bei den Propheten. BZAW* 40 (1925); A. B. Ehrlich, *RHB,* II, esp. 337; H. Ewald, "Uebersicht der 1852-53 erschienenen Schriften zur biblischen Wissenschaft 1.b) Über biblische Sprachwissenschaft," *Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissenschaft* 5 (1853) 215-21, esp. 216-17; H.-J. Fabry, *Die Wurzel* שׁוּב *in der Qumran-Literatur. BBB* 46 (1975), esp. 163; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefîre. BietOr* 19 (1967), esp. 119-20; J. C. Greenfield, "Stylistic Aspects of Sefire Treaty Inscriptions," *AcOr* 29 (1965) 1-18, esp. 4; A. Guillaume, "Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography: A Comparative Study III," *AbrN* 3 (1961/62) 1-10; O. Hagemeyer, "'Lass es uns wiederkehren!' Ein dunkles Schriftwort," *BiLe* 10 (1969) 212-18; J. Hagug, *Two Treaties by R. Jehuda of Fez,* ed. J. W. Nutt (London, 1870), esp. 57; W. Hengstenberg, *Beiträge zur Einleitung ins AT,* II (Berlin, 1836), 104-6; W. L. Holladay, *The Root šûbh in the OT* (Leiden, 1958); T. Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and the Ancient Versions of Zechariah ix–xiv," *OTS* 7 (1950) 1-142; A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, 1962), esp. 67 n. 4; E. Z. Melamed, "Biblical Expressions in Reference to God," *Tarbiz* 19 (1947) 1-18, esp. 9-12; S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (Eng. trans., repr. 2 vols. in 1; Nashville, 1962), esp. II, 249-50; H.-P. Müller, "Hiob und seine Freunde," *ThS* 103 (1970) esp. 36 n. 85; E. Preuschen, "Die Bedeutung von שׁוּב שְׁבוּת im AT," *ZAW* 15 (1895) 1-74; R. E. Price, "A Lexicographical Study of *glh, šbh,* and *šwb* in Reference to Exile in the Tanach" (diss., Duke, 1977); L. Prijs, "*schūb* Hifil," *TZ* 5 (1949) 152-53; T. M. Raitt, *A Theology of Exile: Judgment/Deliverance in Jeremiah and Ezekiel* (Philadelphia, 1977); N. Schlögel, "*šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ,*" *WZKM* 38 (1931) 68-75; J. A. Soggin, "שׁוּב *šûb* to return," *TLOT,* III, 1312-17; H. N. Torczyner, "*ligḇûlôṯ haṣṣûrôt ballāšôn,*" *Leš* 9 (1938) 163-94, esp. 192; I. Willi-Plein, "*ŠWB ŠBWT* — eine Wiederer-

I. 1. *Occurrences.* The expression *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ/šᵉḇîṯ* occurs 32 times in the OT, including 4 times in one verse (Ezk. 16:53) and twice in two parallel psalms (14:7 par. 53:7[Eng. 6]; in Jer. 33:7 the vb. *šûḇ* twice takes the obj. *šᵉḇûṯ*.

Among the substantival forms, *šᵉḇûṯ* occurs 18 times, *šᵉḇîṯ* twice; then 8 times *Q šᵉḇûṯ, K šᵉḇîṯ,* and 3 times *Q šᵉḇîṯ, K šᵉḇûṯ;* once *šîḇaṯ;* always in the construct state or with a suffix.

The verb occurs 18 times in the qal (19 if with the versions one reads *wᵉšaḇtî* in Ezk. 16:53b instead of MT *ûšᵉḇîṯ*), 6 times in the hiphil, and 3 times *K* qal, *Q* hiphil.

The majority of occurrences are in Jeremiah (12 times), Ezekiel (7), and the Psalms (5); of the remaining books, Deuteronomy, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Job, and Lamentations have one occurrence each, Zephaniah 2.

The subject is always Yahweh, except perhaps once the prophets (Lam. 2:14). The objects are almost always peoples or countries, including geographic regions of Israel (8 times); Gentile peoples or countries (4 [5?] times), including Moab, Ammon, Elam, Egypt, (Sodom?); and once a person (Job 42:10).

2. *Derivation and Meaning.* The term *šᵉḇûṯ/šᵉḇîṯ* looks like a derivation of *šāḇâ,* "take captive," hence, "captivity, exile," a meaning possible in most contexts assuming one construes *šûḇ* transitively in the sense of "lead back," whence the frequent interpretation "turn/alter the captivity," i.e., "lead out of captivity" (Preuschen) and "cancel debt imprisonment" (Baumann).[1] Some scholars also suggest understanding *šᵉḇût* as deriving (in some manner) from *yšb,* leading to the meaning "return to one's place of residence" (Cazelles) or even "restore to stability" (Guillaume). Such interpretations, however, are unlikely, since no causative meaning for *šûḇ* qal has been attested.

Hence since Ewald, Böttcher, and Dietrich, *šᵉḇûṯ* has generally been derived from *šûḇ,* albeit with some difficulty attaching to the *shewa* (see the discussion below). On this view, *šᵉḇûṯ/šᵉḇîṯ* is then understood as an internal object[2] of *šûḇ,* and the expression means "turn a turn," i.e., bring about a turn, or even more generally "reestablish an earlier condition (of good fortune)," an interpretation that has generally been accepted[3] even though it faces the same difficulties with regard to *šûḇ* qal. I will attempt a different solution by suggesting that although *šᵉḇûṯ* is indeed to be taken as the internal object of *šûḇ,* the verb itself is to be understood in its usual meaning, "return."

Ben-Yishar — Zipor

More recent scholarship has concentrated on three linguistic problems: (a) the root of *šᵉḇûṯ;* (b) the (predominant) qal form of *šûḇ;* and (c) the meaning of the connection between *šûḇ* (qal or hiphil) and *šᵉḇûṯ.*

---

wägung," *ZAH* 4 (1991) 55-71; H. Winckler, *Der alte Orient und die Geschichtsforschung. MVAG* 11 (Berlin, 1906) 24ff.; → שׁוב *šûḇ.*

1. Cf. *KBL*², 940.
2. *GK,* §117p,q.
3. *HAL,* III, 1385ff., and most comms.

(a) The *shewa* in *šᵉḇûṯ* allegedly points to the root *šbh,* just as *zᵉnûṯ* derives from *znh* and *pᵉḏûṯ* from *pdh.* Dietrich draws attention to the alternation between related weak verbs of different classes,[4] whence → *śûś* > *śāśôn* > const. *śᵉśôn,* and on that model also → *šûḇ* > *šāḇûṯ* > const. *šᵉḇûṯ*. Dietrich alternatively assumes the existence of an original construct form *šāḇûṯ* that was later erroneously read as *šᵉḇûṯ* when later Judaism took the form to be a substantival construction of *šbh.*

(b) Dietrich postulates a transitive meaning for *šûḇ* qal. Although he does concede that OT proof texts for trans. *šûḇ* qal can be refuted (Nu. 10:36; Job 39:12 *K;* Ps. 85:5[4]; Isa. 52:8; 63:17; Mic. 2:8; Nah. 2:3[2]), he adduces the analogy with other verbs such as *ml',* *ḥzq,* *ḥnn,* and *r'h,* and especially with verbs conceptually related to *šûḇ* such as *pnh* and *hpk,* whose qal exhibits both intransitive and transitive meanings.[5] These examples, however, represent verbs for which no hiphil form is attested (e.g., *hpk*) or whose intransitive meaning can exhibit a transitive element (e.g., *r'h, škb*); one can ignore verbs such as *ml'* and *pnh* whose Hebrew logic and semantics do not coincide with Western examples. None of these considerations applies to *šûḇ,* whose qal and hiphil are consistently differentiated.

(c) According to Dietrich, *šᵉḇûṯ* represents the internal object of a trans. vb. *šûḇ* with the overall meaning "lead someone back." Baumann, however, has already noted that the meaning Dietrich develops here, "turn someone's fate," is in fact a Germanism. Nonetheless, with contextual qualification this particular sense probably most closely approximates what is meant.[6]

Adducing the Aramaic occurrence in Sefire *(šwb* haphel + *šybt),* Fabry[7] proposes a historical interpretation according to which the original expression possibly contained a hiphil verb form[8] that was reduced to a qal form for the sake of linguistic ease or alliteration while yet preserving its own original causative aspect.[9]

Willi-Plein understands *šᵉḇûṯ* as a genuine internal object of intransitive-modal *šûḇ* qal with the meaning "God looks after (something indicated by the genitive or suffix of *šᵉḇûṯ*), comes back to his affairs, begins anew from his earlier decision or condition." Willi-Plein emphasizes that the meaning is not that Yahweh comes back to someone in an (anthropomorphic) concrete sense, but rather that he reconsiders or renews a certain condition. Following this line of thinking, the meaning is then "turn someone's turning point for the better," i.e., from an earlier or previous point of departure. Willi-Plein then postulates a second (still OT) phase in which this earlier meaning of the expression became obsolete and was reinterpreted and corrected into the return or "leading back" of the exiles, executed by the slight correction of the *mater lectionis w* in *šûḇ* qal imperfect to *y,* which yielded the hiphil form (in 4 passages; in 3 others it occurs only in *Q*).

---

4. *GK,* §77.
5. *GK,* §117v-bb.
6. Cf. H. D. Preuss, *OT Theology. OTL* (2 vols.; Eng. trans. 1996), II, 298.
7. Fabry, 163 n. 311; see II.5 below.
8. See also G. Rinaldi, "(2 Sam 19,33; Ps 126,1): 1. permanenza. 2. ritorno," *BeO* 14 (1972) 282.
9. → שׁוּב *šûḇ.*

In the case of qal forms in which such an alteration was not possible without violating the consonantal text, an *'eṯ* was inserted before *šᵉḇûṯ* and construed as the prep. "with," i.e., Yahweh returns with his host of exiles. Where *'eṯ* was not included, *šûḇ* qal was understood transitively. The orthography *šᵉḇîṯ* instead of *šᵉḇûṯ* arose similarly (Ezk. 16:53 bis; otherwise 8 times only as *K,* 3 times only as *Q*), since *šᵉḇîṯ* suggests the understanding as "host of exiles" (according to Nu. 20:29). All these considerations can point to a later correction (during the OT or post-OT period) or even to late postexilic texts in which the original formula was no longer current (e.g., Zeph. 3:20).

One ancient Jewish exegetical tradition preserved in versions (Qumran and Saadiah) and Midrashim understands *šᵉḇûṯ* (return) as the internal object of *šûḇ* qal meaning "Yahweh returns to the matter at hand."

Fabry

Dietrich and, with him, Fohrer and others found in this expression a term at home in Dtr eschatology (Mowinckel finds the formula's origin in the enthronement festival, Weiser in the amphictyonic festival of the covenant[10]).

3. *Versions.* Although the versions almost always render the vb. *šûḇ* transitively in the sense of "bring back," they vacillate in their rendering of the noun *šᵉḇûṯ/šᵉḇîṯ,* with renderings generally concentrating on three meanings: (a) captivity, exile; (b) turn, turning point; (c) remorse. The LXX renders the sense of (a) 5 times as *apoikía* and 14 times as *aichmalōsía,* then the sense of (b) 4 times as *apostrophḗ.* In Job 42:10 the LXX renders *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* as the general *ēúxēsen,* "made flourish, grow." The Pal. Tgs. construe the sense of (c) as "repentance, remorse" in Dt. 30:3, and the Tg. thus in Lam. 2:14: *tᵉyûḇtā'.* Otherwise the Tgs. always construe in the sense of (a), e.g., *gālûṯ* (once, Ps. 85:2[1], *šiḇyᵉṯā';* in Ezk. 16:53 the Tg. has a problem with the MT, whence 3 times *'ammā',* "people," and once *galûṯā'*). The Vg. vacillates between sense (a) (17 times as *captivitas,* twice *captivus*) and sense (b) (7 times as *conversio,* once each as *reversio* and *restituo* [both in Ezk. 16:53]). In Job 42:10 the Vg. translates as *poenitentia.* The Pesh. always follows sense (b) *(šᵉḇîṯā')* (even in Job 42:10), the exception being Lam. 2:14, where senses (a) and (c) are united as a double translation "that you repent and I bring back your captivity."

II. OT.

1. *General Considerations.* Most of the *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* passages in the qal refer to Israel's exile, beginning with the deportation of the northern kingdom/Israelites in 722 B.C.E. by Tiglath-pileser, to the carrying off of 200,250 Judeans from cities conquered by Sennacherib in 701, on to the deportations of the Judeans in 598 and 587 by the Babylonians.

Some passages refer to other situations of misfortune, including general (perhaps social) distress (Ps. 14:7 par. 53:7[6]), drought (85:2[1]; 126:1,4), perhaps ethical-religious misbehavior (Hos. 6:11), all of which represent national catastrophes that Israelites expe-

10. A. Weiser, *The Psalms. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 26ff.

rienced at the withdrawal of their beneficent God. The thwarting of such disasters was thus dependent on or identical with Yahweh's return to his people. At the time of the threat and reality of the Babylonian exile, i.e., in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, authors understood this return concretely. Yahweh would return to the abandoned temple (Jer. 12:7; Ezk. 9–11) with his people (Isa. 52:8; Ezk. 43:1ff.; Zech. 1:16; 8:3). Only Job 42:10 understands this situation as a return to an individual. Although Yahweh initially delivered Job over to Satan (2:6), this situation is now reversed in that Yahweh returns to Job.

This understanding is supported by the verbs parallel with *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ,* all of which express Yahweh's (renewed) favor and attention: 4 times *rḥm* piel; once each *rṣh, pqd, mṣ'* niphal, *rp', nś' pānîm, ntn lᵉšēm wᵉliṯhillâ, ntn yᵉšû'aṯ/yᵉšû'ôṯ* (in two par. psalms), *bnh.* In the two passages in which *šûḇ* (qal) *šᵉḇûṯ* stands before (and par. to) *šûḇ* hiphil, the meaning is that Yahweh's return to someone brings about that person's return home.

2. *Hiphil.* The expression *šûḇ* hiphil + *šᵉḇûṯ* means "bring back, restore," a meaning that fits the two indisputable hiphil passages Jer. 33:7 and Lam. 2:14. Lam. 2:14 is the only passage in which Yahweh is not the subject: "They [the prophets] have not exposed your iniquity in order (thereby) to lead you back (to Yahweh) [NRSV 'to restore your fortunes']." Jer. 33:7 reads: "When Yahweh brings Judah and Israel back (to the land), Jerusalem's houses will be rebuilt." Perhaps also Jer. 32:44: "Fields shall be bought again when Yahweh brings Judah back (from exile)." The other three passages using the vb. *šûḇ* in the hiphil imperfect *('āšîḇ)* (Jer. 33:11; 49:6; Ezk. 39:25) can perhaps be grouped together with Jer. 33:26; 49:39; Joel 4:1(3:1), where *K* reads *'āšûḇ,* but *Q 'āšîḇ.* The term *'āšûḇ* could possibly everywhere represent the original form that was then altered to *'āšîḇ.* In two passages in Jeremiah referring to foreign nations (49:6, Ammon; 49:39, Elam), later editors may have replaced the qal form by the hiphil or *Q* hiphil for *K* qal in order to promise the pagan nations the return home but not Yahweh's personal favor (Jer. 48:47 on Moab and Ezk. 29:14 on Egypt, both in the qal pf., could not be corrected). Even so, the two *'āšîḇ* occurrences in Jer. 33:11 and Ezk. 39:25 can be understood as genuine causative forms. Jer. 33:10 predicts the decimation of the land, hence Yahweh says in v. 11: "for I will restore [i.e., reestablish] the land as at first *(kᵉḇāri'šōnâ).*" In Ezk. 39:25 *'āšîḇ* can be construed as transitive hiphil if vv. 25ff. are viewed not as part of the Gog pericope (according to which Israel is settled in the land), but as the conclusion of Ezekiel's entire salvific pericope.[11] The expression then means "I will now bring Jacob back (to his land)." The preceding concealment of Yahweh's countenance (v. 24) and the following *rḥm* piel, however, also make it possible to understand the expression intransitively (emending *'āšîḇ* to *'āšûḇ*): "I will now return to Jacob."

3. *Qal.* (a) Passages using the qal often address the situation of the exile. Dt. 30:3 stands in a pericope (vv. 1-10) oriented around the key root *šûḇ* (8 times) and focusing

---

11. A secondary expansion according to W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 310, 319.

on the mutual return (turning to one another) between Yahweh and Israel after (29:21-27[22-28]) mutual alienation. After Israel turns back to Yahweh (30:2), v. 3 then reads: *wᵉšāḇ yhwh ᵉlōheykā 'eṯ-šᵉḇûṯᵉkā,* "then Yahweh your God will return to you," with par. *wᵉriḥamekā,* "and have compassion on you," thereby *wᵉšāḇ wᵉqibbeṣkā,* "gathering you again."

Jer. 31:16-23 also focuses on the root *šûḇ* (8 times). After the lament of the ancestress Rachel for her lost children (v. 15), v. 16 says that Rachel's sons will return (to the land) *(wᵉšāḇû),* then in v. 18 Ephraim (the northern kingdom) asks for Yahweh's help in coming back *(hᵃšiḇēnî wᵉ'āšûḇâ);* in v. 19 Israel says, "for after I had turned away *(šûḇî)* I repented." Verse 21 twice says "return (to your land)" *(šûḇî, šûḇîa);* v. 22: "O faithless *(haššôḇâ)* daughter"; v. 23: "once more they shall use these words in the land of Judah and in its towns when I return to them [to the land and cities or men of Judah *(bᵉšûḇî 'eṯ-šᵉḇûṯām).*" Verse 22 with *tᵉšôḇēb* and v. 24 with *yāšᵉḇû* are phonetically related.

The expression *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* in Jer. 29:14 (absent from LXX) and 30:3 is followed by *šûḇ* hiphil, "(afterward) I will lead them back (to their land)," with 29:14 preceded by the par. *wᵉnimṣē'ṯî lāḵem,* "I will let you find me," and *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* followed by *qbṣ* piel: "I will gather you." The context is Jeremiah's letter to the exiles who feel abandoned and rejected by Yahweh in Babylon. According to Jer. 30:18, Yahweh will return to the (abandoned) places where they lived: *hinᵉnî-šāḇ šᵉḇûṯ 'ohᵒlê yaᵃqôḇ* (allusion to Gen. 25:27), parallel with *rḥm* piel, "and have compassion on his dwellings," after no one previously (Jer. 30:17) has cared for them.

Jer. 33:26 also parallels *rḥm* piel and *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ:* "The house of David will rule again over the offspring of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob when I [Yahweh] return to them and have mercy upon them" (after *Q 'āšîḇ* hiphil: "when I bring them back [to the land]" [Jer. 33 is anticipating the exile]). The same pericope also twice uses the hiphil combination: 33:7 (par. *bnh* qal: "for I will restore [i.e., reestablish] the land as at first" and 33:11 (though here the emendation to *'āšûḇ* qal is preferable).

Zephaniah uses the expression twice. Zeph. 2:7 says that when Yahweh seeks them out (NRSV "be mindful of them"; *pqd* qal) and returns to them *(šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ),* they will inherit and possess the Philistine seacoast. Zeph. 3:20 says that Yahweh will give them renown and praise when he returns to them (cf. Isa. 52:8). This concluding salvific liturgy is generally viewed as an addendum.

The same applies to Am. 9:14: "I will return [qal] to my people Israel, and they shall rebuild the ruined cities and inhabit them."

Hos. 6:11b, read together with 7:1a (according to *BHS*), yields a parallel between *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* and *rp'* qal. This combination together with the following yields the interpretation that when Yahweh returns to heal Israel, i.e., when he genuinely looks closely, Israel's wounds, their sins, will reveal themselves.

Joel 4:1(3:1) uses the qal expression in an apocalyptic context (associated as in Zeph. 3:20 with the temporal expression *bā'ēṯ hāhî'*). Here it is not clear whether *K 'āšûḇ 'eṯ-šᵉḇûṯ* foretells Yahweh's return to Judah and Jerusalem or whether this late prophet already understands *šᵉḇûṯ* as "captivity" (whence the causative *Q 'āšîḇ;* 4:3,4,6,7[3:3,4,6,7] mention the Judean exiles and their return).

Ezk. 16:53 represents a special case. In the MT, *wᵉšaḇtî* with *'eṯ* is followed by the obj. *šᵉḇîṯ* with the 3rd fem. pl. suffix, which is then explicated as "the *šᵉḇûṯ (K šᵉḇîṯ)* of Sodom and her daughters and the *šᵉḇûṯ (K šᵉḇîṯ)* of Samaria and her daughters, and the *šᵉḇûṯ (K šᵉḇîṯ)* of your [Jerusalem's] *šᵉḇîṯ* along with theirs." The LXX, Tgs., and Vg. all avoid the obscure doubling of the final *šᵉḇîṯ/šᵉḇûṯ* by rendering the penultimate as the verb form *wᵉšaḇtî,* which probably represents the original form: "and I [Yahweh] will return to you [Jerusalem] along with them [Sodom and Samaria]."

The present MT might have emerged when *šᵉḇûṯ* (here *Q*) was understood as "return," and *šᵉḇîṯ* (also) as "captivity": "and the return of your captives along with them [the captives]." Substantively, however, this exegesis (deriving *šᵉḇîṯ* from *šbh*) does not fit because there were no longer any exiles or any captives from Sodom.

According to Ezekiel's vision of the future reunification of the northern and southern kingdoms (37:15ff.) and the revivification of the Dead Sea and its surroundings (47:1-12), Yahweh will return to all the territories of Palestine with Jerusalem as their center. This *restitutio in integrum* is addressed in 16:55, which says that all three "will return to their former state" *(tāšōḇnā lᵉqaḏmāṯān).*

(b) After a period of drought signaling Yahweh's absence (Jer. 14:8-9), Yahweh returns to his land and people with rain and blessing (Ruth 1:6, *pqd;* cf. Ps. 65:10[9]). Accordingly in Ps. 85:2(1) *šāḇᵉtā šᵉḇûṯ ya'ᵃqōḇ,* in view of v. 13(12), may be a petition for fertility; it parallels *rāṣîṯā yhwh 'arṣeḵā* and means the same thing as *šûḇēnû* [extensive accusative of place, hence the emendation with *BHS* is unnecessary] *'ᵉlōhê yiš'ēnû,* "return to us, God of our salvation,"[12] in v. 5(4), after he has turned his countenance away in anger (*šûḇ* hiphil, v. 4[3]).

Ps. 126, whose ending (vv. 4b-6) shows it to be a petition and/or thanksgiving for fertility, may also refer to drought (v. 1): "When Yahweh returns to Zion *(bᵉšûḇ yhwh 'eṯ-šîḇaṯ ṣîyôn),* we will be like those who dream." Then v. 4 pleads, *šûḇâ yhwh 'eṯ-šᵉḇîṯēnû (K šbwtnw),* "return to us, O Yahweh, like the watercourses in the Negeb [which flow with water in the winter after the summer dryness]."

(c) The parallel Psalms 14 and 53 lament over the wicked who believe that God does not concern himself with earthly matters (14:1-4; 53:2-5[1-4]), since he has turned away. Believers react by hoping (v. 7) that Israel's deliverance might come from Zion (14:7; 53:7[6]) when Yahweh turns again to his people *(šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ).*

Ben-Yashar — Zipor

(d) Yahweh's eschatological turning to foreign nations (Jer. 48:47; 49:6,39; Ezk. 29:14) presents a special problem. In any event this situation does imply that after primordial human beings were alienated from Yahweh (Gen. 1–11), prompting Yahweh's special election of Israel in the justification of Abraham, the nations, including Israel, will one day turn to one another, as also prophesied by Isa. 2:1ff. (par. Mic. 4:1ff.); Zeph. 3:9; and Isa. 56:6ff., and as anticipated by the novella Jonah.

Fabry

---

12. See C. A. and E. G. Briggs, *Psalms II. ICC* (1917), 231-32.

4. *Other Passages with šûḇ.* The expression *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* as a reference to the return or renewal of Yahweh's favor can be assessed in connection with other OT passages that speak of Yahweh's return.

References to Yahweh's return to Israel can be found in passages such as Nu. 10:36; Ps. 80:15(14) (with the key word *šûḇ* hiphil occurring in the refrain vv. 4,8,20[3,7,19]); 85:5(4) (with the key word *šûḇ* occurring 6 times including *šᵉḇûṯ* in v. 2[1]); 90:13; Isa. 63:17; Mic. 7:19.

Isa. 52:8; Zech. 1:6; and 8:3 mention the return to Zion/Jerusalem. Ezk. 43:1-7 graphically describes Yahweh's return to the Jerusalem temple after his withdrawal in Ezk. 9–11. Concerning Yahweh's return path, cf. Isa. 35:8; 40:3-5. Passages such as Ps. 85:2(1) and 126:1-4 show that geographical and ethnic designations cannot be distinguished as objects of *šûḇ*.

Ps. 6:5(4) could possibly be adduced as an example of Yahweh's turning again to certain individuals (if *šûḇâ* there is not modal). Mutual returning is mentioned in Dt. 30:2-3 (also vv. 8-9); Jer. 31:18-21; perhaps most markedly in Zech. 1:3 and Mal. 3:7: *šûḇû 'ēlay wᵉ'āšûḇ/wᵉ'āšûḇâ ᵃlêḵem,* "return to me, and I will return to you"; cf. also 2 Ch. 30:6.

Unlike the much-discussed theme of human return (repentance), the theologoumenon of God's return to human beings or of their mutual return has previously received little attention. Most OT theologians do not address the problem, one exception being E. Balla, who addresses it in connection with Isa. 52:8,[13] as does A. S. van der Woude in connection with Zech. 1:3.[14] In his *History of Israelite Religion,* G. Fohrer asks just what prompted what, namely, God's return to Israel (according to Zech. 1:3) or vice versa (according to Isa. 44:21-22; 55:7).[15] W. Holladay postulates the mutuality of return within the covenantal relationship according to Zech. 1:3.[16]

5. *Aramaic.* The Old Aramaic occurrence of *šybt* in the Sefire inscription *(wk't hšbw 'lhn šybt b[yt 'by])* hardly contributes anything to illuminating the problem, since here *šûḇ* is used not in the much-discussed peal, but rather clearly in the haphel: "and now the gods brought back the house of my father," i.e., reestablished his dynasty.[17] In any event, the Sefire occurrence does support the MT of Ps. 126:1, *šîḇaṯ ṣîyôn* (cf. Fitzmyer; Greenfield).

III. 1. *Targum of Job.* The oldest witness for a Jewish exegetical tradition of *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* qal (intrans.) as an internal accusative is 11QtgJob, which renders Job 42:10 as *wtb 'lh' l'ywb brḥmyn,* "God returned in compassion to Job."

---

13. *Die Botschaft der Propheten* (Tübingen, 1958), 407.

14. "Seid nicht wie eure Väter! Bemerkungen zu Sacharja 1,5 und seinem Kontext," *Prophecy. FS G. Fohrer. BZAW* 150 (1980), 163-64; previously: S. Dim, *FS A. Biram* (Jerusalem, 1956), 122-31.

15. *History of Israelite Religion* (Eng. trans., Nashville, 1972), 343.

16. Holladay, 141.

17. *KAI,* 224.24-25; cf. *KAI,* II, 265, 271.

2. *Qumran.* The expression *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* does not occur in the Qumran writings (concerning 11QtgJob, see above). 11QPsᵃ 4:13 reads *šbwtynw* in Ps. 126:4. The poorly preserved 4QpHos 10:16 (on Hos. 2:9[7]; between the lacuna and the end of the line) contains *bšwb šby*. This fragment, lacking any context, does not allow one to determine whether the *pesher* is copying these words from the expression *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* and thus understanding *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ* as a return or leading back of the exiles. The same applies to 4Q485 1,4. The absence of this expression in Qumran can only mean that one could no longer use it.[18]

Ben-Yashar — Zipor

18. Cf. Willi-Plein, 68.

שֵׁבֶט *šēḇeṭ*

Contents: I. 1. Occurrences; 2. Distribution; 3. LXX. II. Secular Meaning: 1. Rod/Staff; 2. Function: a. Threshing Rod; b. Shepherd's Staff; c. Rod of Discipline; d. Scepter; 3. Tribe. III. Religious Usage: 1. Yahweh's Natural Order; 2. Yahweh as Disciplinarian; 3. Yahweh as Shepherd; 4. Election by Yahweh; 5. Messianic Interpretation. IV. Qumran: 1. Tribe; 2. Messianic Interpretation.

šēḇeṭ. L. C. Allen, "The Rejected Sceptre in Ezekiel XXI 15b, 18a," *VT* 29 (1989) 67-71; A. G. Auld, "Tribal Terminology in Joshua and Judges," *Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Convegno sul tema: Le origine d'Israele* (Rome, 1987), 87-98; C. Begg, "The Reading *šbṭy(km)* in Deut 29,9 and 2 Sam 7,7," *ETL* 58 (1982) 87-105; G. Bettenzoli, "Lessemi ebraici di radice *šby*," *Hen* 4 (1982) 129-60; H. Bonnet, *Die Waffen der Völker des Alten Orients* (Leipzig, 1926); A. Brenner, "*Maṭṭeh* and *šebeṭ* Semantically," *Leš* 44 (1979/80) 100-108; F. Focke, "Szepter und Krummstab," *FS A. Fuchs* (Paderborn, 1950), 337-87; G. Fohrer, "Keule," *BHHW,* II, 946; S. Gevirtz, "On Hebrew *šēbeṭ* 'Judge,'" *The Bible World. FS C. H. Gordon* (New York, 1980), 61-66; N. K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh* (Maryknoll, N.Y., 1979), esp. 245-56; A. Hassan, "Die Wörter *šbd* and *mȝwd,*" *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Kairo* 35 (1979) 119-24; A. Lemaire, "'Avec un Sceptre de Fer.' Ps. II,9 et l'archéologie," *BN* 32 (1986) 25-30; N. P. Lemche, *Early Israel. SVT* 37 (1985), esp. 274-85; M. L. Mayer Modena, "A proposito di alcune denominiazioni del 'bastone' in ebraico biblico," *Annali della facoltà di filosofia e lettere dell' università statale die Milano* 40 (1987) 25-30; G. E. Mendenhall, *The Tenth Generation* (Baltimore, 1973), esp. 184-88; J. Milgrom, "Priestly Terminology and the Political and Social Structure of the Pre-Monarchic Israel," *JQR* 69 (1978/79) 65-81; D. Murray, "Once Again *'t 'ḥd šbṭy yśr'l* in II Samuel 7:7," *RB* 94 (1987) 389-96; J. P. J. Olivier, "The Sceptre of Justice and Ps. 45:7b," *JNSL* 7 (1979) 45-54; J. Pedersen, *ILC,* I-II, esp. 29-46; E. Power, "The Shepherd's Two Rods in Modern Palestine and in Some Passages of the OT," *Bibl* 9 (1928) 434-42; P. V. Reid, "*šbṭy* in 2 Samuel 7:7," *CBQ* 37 (1975) 17-20; J. M. Sasson, "A Note on

I. 1. *Occurrences.* The Heb. noun *šēḇeṭ,* deriving perhaps from a root *šbṭ,*[1] occurs also as Akk. *šabbiṭu,* OSA *sbṭ,* Egyp. *šbd* (Copt. *šḇôt*), and Aram. *šabṭā'.* As attested in Assyrian, the vb. *šabāṭu,* "strike, beat,"[2] could be a denominative,[3] though the presence of a vb. *šbṭ,* "strike, beat," in Ethiopic might militate against this view.[4] It is unclear whether the Ugaritic PN *ṯbṭ* belongs to this noun or to the root *ṯpṭ,* "judge, direct."[5]

2. *Distribution.* The noun *šēḇeṭ* occurs 192 times in the Hebrew OT.[6] These occurrences are distributed as follows: 3 times in Genesis; 4 in Exodus; 1 in Leviticus; 6 in Numbers; 18 in Deuteronomy; 33 in Joshua; 16 in Judges; 8 in 1 Samuel; 10 in 2 Samuel; 11 in 1 Kings; 2 in 2 Kings; 12 in 1 Chronicles; 4 in 2 Chronicles; 3 in Job; 15 in Psalms; 8 in Proverbs; 12 in Isaiah; 2 in Jeremiah; 1 in Lamentations; 16 in Ezekiel; 1 in Hosea; 2 in Amos; 2 in Micah; 2 in Zechariah. These occurrences are joined by one in Biblical Aramaic (Ezra 6:17), about 30 in the Qumran writings, and 2 in extrabiblical Aramaic.[7]

3. *LXX.* The LXX translates *šēḇeṭ/šᵉḇaṭ* largely with *phylḗ* (119 times) or *archíphylos* (once) and *phýlarchos* (once), though also with *rhábdos* (28) and *skḗptron* (17); *huiós* is used 7 times, *zygón* and *plēgḗ* twice each, and then once each *árchōn* (Gen. 49:10), *ánthrōpos* (Nu. 24:17), *lógos* (Isa. 11:4), *mástix* (Job 21:9), *paideía* (Job 37:13), *triabélē* (2 S. 18:14), and *baktēría* (Prov. 13:24). Nine passages lack a corresponding Greek equivalent.

II. Secular Meaning.

1. *Rod/Staff.* The noun *šēḇeṭ* basically means "staff, stick, rod" (though cf. Mendenhall: "leader's staff"[8]). Such a staff is generally made of wood (cf. Ps. 2:9, "rod of iron"; Isa. 10:15; Ezk. 19:11,14; 21:15[Eng. 10]),[9] hence it can be broken (Isa. 14:5,29). People raise it up to swing it *(nwp)* or to strike something with it (*nkh,* Ex. 21:20; Prov. 23:13-14; Isa. 10:24; 14:29; 30:31; Mic. 4:14[5:1]; *mḥṣ,* Nu. 24:17). Parallel terms include → מטה *maṭṭeh* (Isa. 9:3[4]; 10:5,15,24; 14:5; 28:27; cf. 30:31-32), which according to Schunck[10]

šarbîṭ," *VT* 22 (1972) 111; K. D. Schunck, "Stamm 1. AT," *BHHW,* III, 1851-52; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 475-83; H. Weippert, "Keule," *BRL*², 185; J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin, ⁹1958); → משפחה *mišpaḥâ;* → בית *bayiṯ;* → מטה *maṭṭeh;* → מקל *maqqēl;* → נגע *nāga'.*

1. *HAL,* III, 1388a.
2. *AHw,* III, 1119.
3. Cf. *GesB,* 801.
4. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1387-88.
5. *KTU* 4.122, 22: *šb' kbd dṯbṭ,* "seven weights of *ṯbṭ*"; *PNU,* 22, 199 with reference to the alternation of the labials *b* and *p;* cf. also Gevirtz; Murray.
6. 190 times according to *HAL,* III, 1388a.
7. Beyer, 700.
8. Mendenhall, 184-85.
9. Cf. G. André, → מקל *maqqēl,* VIII, 550, "fresh tree branches."
10. Schunck, 1851.

is preferred by P, and occasionally *miš'eneṯ*[11] (Ps. 23:4), *mᵉḥōqēq* (Gen. 49:10), or *nega'*[12] (Ps. 89:33[32]).

The narrative remark that Joab "took three sticks in his hand, and thrust them into the heart of Absalom" (2 S. 18:14) may recall long "poles" (NRSV "spears")[13] or even a "bunch of stout sticks."[14] 2 S. 23:21 par. 1 Ch. 11:23 does, however, emphasize the contrast when Benaiah, armed only with a staff, faces an Egyptian armed with a spear, disarms the Egyptian, and kills him with his own spear. Dalman points out that the "staff always refers to a weapon,"[15] and Fohrer renders this word as "club, cudgel." These considerations make clear that objects that can be struck can be quite diverse. Alongside people and nations (e.g., Ex. 21:20; 2 S. 7:14; Ps. 2:9; Prov. 10:13; 13:24; 22:15; 23:13-14; 26:3; 29:15; Isa. 14:29; Mic. 4:14[5:1]), one also encounters animals (Isa. 9:3[4]) and things (Isa. 28:27).

2. *Function.* a. *Threshing Rod.* The rod is mentioned as a threshing tool in connection with nutmeg and cumin, and the staff *(maṭṭeh)* in connection with dill. In contrast to the threshing sledge, which was used primarily for grain, gentler beating with the "threshing stick" was apparently preferred for more delicate produce.[16]

b. *Shepherd's Staff.* Threshing, however, is not the only agricultural use of the rod or staff, for even if we lack explicit portrayals, various passages do presuppose that the staff was part of the shepherd's equipment, serving in tending and protecting the flock (cf. *r'h,* Ps. 2:9; 23:4, cf. v. 1; Mic. 7:14). Dalman describes the shepherd's staff in detail, emphasizing that, alongside the club, it was the shepherd's most important weapon in holding off wild animals and thieves from the flock.[17] At the same time, this staff was an "aid in guiding the flock."[18] The shepherd's staff was also used for counting the flock or for separating out certain animals from it, as attested in Lev. 27:32 with respect to the tithe: "every tenth one that passes under the shepherd's staff shall be holy to Yahweh" (cf. also Ezk. 20:37).[19]

Because Isa. 9:3(4) mentions the "rod of their driver" in addition to the "yoke of their burden," Dalman suggests understanding the former as the "ox or cattle rod" the plowman uses for striking.[20]

c. *Rod of Discipline.* The rod was a popular instrument for education, punishment, and discipline. It was the disciplinary rod of the pedagogue (Prov. 10:13; 13:24; 22:15; 23:13-14; 26:3; 29:15; cf. also Ezk. 21:15,18[10,13]) and can be explicitly designated *šēbeṭ mûsār,* "rod of discipline" (Prov. 22:15), and *šēbeṭ ᵃnāšîm,* "rod of men" (2 S.

11. → שׁען *š'n.*
12. → נגע *nāga'.*
13. H. W. Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1964), 354.
14. P. K. McCarter, *II Samuel. AB* 9 (1984), 407.
15. *AuS,* II (1932), 57.
16. *AuS,* III (1933), 91-93, 114.
17. *AuS,* VI (1939), 221-22, 233-40. See also Fohrer.
18. Ibid., 238.
19. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 392; *AuS,* VI, 239.
20. *AuS,* II, 120; VI, 239.

7:14). This background emerges in references to the rod of discipline of the nations, e.g., to the rod that strikes the Philistines (Isa. 14:29), the chastising rod of the Assyrians that strikes Israel (Mic. 4:14[5:1]; Isa. 10:5,24, "[driver's] goad";[21] differently as: "staff of the ruler,"[22] but also in reference to "God in his role as a teacher"[23]), or the "rod of discipline of the wicked" (*šēḇeṭ hārešaʿ*, Ps. 125:3; NRSV "scepter of wickedness").

The assertion that the "rod of his anger *(šēḇeṭ ʿeḇrāṯô)* will fail" (Prov. 22:8) refers to the punishment of the wicked through which their arrogance is broken. In Lam. 3:1 the same expression, "rod of his anger," refers to Yahweh's wrath in judgment.

d. *Scepter.* The term *šēḇeṭ* is also used to refer to the symbol of leadership. The assertion in Gen. 49:10 that the "staff" and "scepter" *(mᵉḥōqēq)* (cf. NRSV) will not depart from Judah means that Judah's dominance will continue. Since Jgs. 5:14 also uses *šēḇeṭ* and *mᵉḥōqēq* in parallel, Gen. 49:10 cannot refer to the scepter of a Judean king;[24] rather "the meaning . . . must be the marshal's or commander's staff"[25] as a reference to Judah's sovereignty within a tribal alliance during the pre-state period.

Jgs. 5:14 also refers to the scepter as a symbol of tribal leadership, enumerating alongside the *mᵉḥōqᵉqîm* of Machir also "those who bear the marshal's staff" from Zebulun *(mōšᵉḵîm bᵉšēḇeṭ)*.[26] Am. 1:5 and 8 mention "the one who holds the scepter" *(tômēḵ šēḇeṭ)* from Beth-eden, Ashkelon, and Ekron, probably a reference to city rather than tribal princes. Isa. 14:5 refers in a general fashion to the "scepter of rulers" *(šēḇeṭ mōšᵉlîm)*. Ps. 45:7(6) (similarly also Ps. 2:9; Isa. 14:29) shows unequivocally that the royal scepter was also called *šēḇeṭ*. The Jerusalem king is told: "your royal scepter is a scepter of equity" *(šēḇeṭ mîšōr)*. The bearer of royal dominion also carries a scepter as a symbol of his power.[27] Hence the term *šēḇeṭ* came to refer to power and dominion, for example, in the assertion that the "scepter of Egypt shall depart" (Zech. 10:11), suggesting that the scepter rising out of Israel in Balaam's vision (Nu. 24:17) is to be understood as a symbol of royal power in reference to the rise of David. Since the term *šēḇeṭ* parallels "star" *(kôḵāḇ)* here, B. Gemser offered the attractive suggestion that one understand *šēḇeṭ* as "comet" *(BHS: stella crinata)*.[28]

The "rulers' scepters" growing from the mighty branches of the vineyard represent ruling figures (Ezk. 19:11,14).[29]

---

21. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1983), 245.
22. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 397.
23. Ibid., 416.
24. See G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1972), 424-26.
25. C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50. CC* (Eng. trans. 1986), 230.
26. See in this regard also J. A. Soggin, *Judges. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1981), 89.
27. See H. -J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), on Ps. 45; concerning the iconography, cf. Fohrer and Weippert.
28. B. Gemser, "Der Stern aus Jakob (Num. 24,17)," *ZAW* 43 (1925) 301-2; cf. already *RHB*, II, 205; so also J. Hempel, "Wichtige Aufsätze in Zeitschriften und Sammelwerken," *ZAW* 62 (1950) 276 n. 3.
29. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 397.

3. *Tribe.* The overwhelming majority of occurrences of *šēbeṭ* exhibit the meaning "tribe."[30] One can probably agree with Mendenhall with regard to the semantic development in this direction, namely, that on the basis of the meaning of *šēbeṭ* as the "scepter" of the tribal leader it then came to refer to the "tribe" itself,[31] already suggesting that the sociological entity "tribe" emerged only secondarily.[32] The names of Israelite tribes may allude to this situation; like Ephraim and probably also Judah and Gilead, the tribal names originally represented Palestinian territorial names that the Israelites who settled in those territories adopted as self-designations. It is questionable whether the conclusion follows that the tribe thereby became a territorial entity itself[33] or was from the outset merely a geographical unity,[34] since the designation itself says nothing about whether the entity so-named first began to exist as such only with the acquisition of the name. Much evidence suggests that the organization of tribes and the feeling of cohesiveness among Israel's tribes date to a period earlier than the settlement in the land. The Song of Deborah, dating to the early period of the judges (Jgs. 5), already attests both, and the tribal sayings and their collections in the blessings of Jacob (Gen. 49) and Moses (Dt. 33) provide unequivocal witnesses for the pre-state period in the larger sense. At the same time, they draw attention to the self-understanding of an Israelite tribe (cf., e.g., Gen. 49:16), to the interaction between the tribes, and to their religious possessions.[35]

As striking as it is that this tribal organization was not replaced by territorial organization after settlement in the land (cf., e.g., Nu. 24:2 and Ezk. 45:8), it is even more striking that the institution of the monarchy prompted no fundamental change in this regard either, so that the tribe continued to represent the basic organizational unit of the people at large for the Israelite. For when at the city gate Absalom asks those coming into Jerusalem, "From what city are you?" and receives the answer, "Your servant is of such and such a tribe in Israel" (2 S. 15:2), one sees that, in contrast to the city orientation of the Canaanites,[36] tribal membership is determinative for the Israelites,[37] whereby "Israel" here probably refers to the northern and southern kingdoms,[38] something otherwise expressed by "the twelve tribes of Israel" (Gen. 49:28; Ex. 24:4; 28:21; 39:14; Ezk. 47:33), "all the tribes of Israel" (Dt. 18:5; 29:20[21]; Josh. 24:1; Jgs. 20:2; 2 S. 5:1; 19:10[9]; 20:14; 24:2; Ezk. 48:19; Zech. 9:1, etc.), perhaps with the additional qualification "from Dan to Beer-sheba" (2 S. 24:2).

One observation of utmost significance for understanding the Yahweh faith is that, as Wellhausen says,[39] Moses did not introduce any new constitution; rather, the old one

---

30. *KBL*², 941: 143 times.
31. Mendenhall, 184-85; cf. *HAL*, III, 1388, and A. Simian-Yofre, → VIII, 245; Gottwald, 245-46.
32. Schunck, 1851.
33. See Gottwald, 253-56.
34. See Lemche, 279-84.
35. See H.-J. Zobel, "Die Stammessprüche des Mose-Segens," *Klio* 46 (1965) 83-92.
36. See *ILC*, I-II, 33-34.
37. Though cf. Gottwald, 256, who understands the answer as an ellipse.
38. P. K. McCarter, *II Samuel. AB* 8 (1980), 357-58.
39. Wellhausen, 20-21.

remained in effect and was still maintained in the land of Canaan and was not even displaced by the monarchy. One sees that Yahweh could be associated with the Israel of Moses without further ado and without any significant breaks or upheaval and thus become the God of Israel. Then, however, this "constitutional structure" of the people of Yahweh remained the ongoing determinative principle consistently maintained throughout history despite new political constitutional forms, thereby preserving within the Yahweh faith the heritage of the "wilderness" through the ages.

The exact description of the sociological status of an Israelite tribe within the system of national organization seems clear given the witness of various texts. The family is followed by the patriarchal house and clan, and these together form the basis of a tribe, which in its own turn is part of the tribal alliance or of the people or state (cf. Dt. 29:17; Josh. 7:14; 13:29; 1 S. 10:19-20; also Nu. 4:18; Jgs. 21:24; 1 S. 9:21).[40]

At least in this self-contained form, however, this organization seems to represent late theory.[41] As difficult as it is to distinguish in individual cases between "clan" and "patriarchal house," a similarly fluid situation often applies to "clan" and "tribe." Jgs. 18:19 mentions the "tribe" and "clan" of the Danites in the same breath; whereas v. 11 mentions only the "Danite clan," v. 1 says that it is the "tribe of the Danites" that is acting (cf. also 13:2; 17:7). Moreover, 21:8 gives the impression that the city of Jabesh is understood as having the status of a *šēḇeṭ*. M. Noth suggests that "the concepts of a people and of a tribe are part of human history, rather than of human reproduction," thereby revealing the various aspects of membership in a group of people.[42] The problem with this view is that like the people, the tribe also traced its origins back to an ancestral father and thus claimed genealogical unity.[43] Hence Wellhausen is correct after all in saying that no one belongs to a tribe except through the family, through the clan, through lineage, and that all *legitimate* community is based on blood relations.[44] One must point out, however, that in the OT the tribe functions neither as an autonomous legal entity nor as a cultic community.

If one takes seriously the definition of an Israelite tribe as being based on blood relations, the question of the leadership of the tribe or tribal alliance does not really arise, just as Wellhausen describes even Arab society as a community without hierarchical authorities.[45] This view is itself contradicted by the fact that *šēḇeṭ* does refer to the scepter, and indeed also to the scepter of the tribal princes. If we ask what such a leader was called, the most likely designation is *rô'š*, "head." Saul is thus called (1 S. 15:17), and Nu. 25:4 and Dt. 33:5 speak of "heads of the people" (NRSV "leaders"). Dt. 5:23 also speaks of the "heads of your tribes and your elders" who approach Yahweh's mountain. The mention of the "officials/princes of the tribes of Israel" in 1 Ch. 28:1 does not seri-

---

40. → II, 113-15; *AncIsr*, 3-15.
41. So *ILC*, I-II, 46; see → IX, 83-84.
42. *The OT World* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1966), 64.
43. So Gottwald, 246.
44. Wellhausen, 21-22; also de Vaux, *AncIsr*, 5.
45. *Rede zur Feier des Geburtstages Sr. Maj. des Kaisers und Königs am 27. January 1900 im Namen der Georg-Augusts-Universität gehalten* (Göttingen, 1900).

ously militate against this understanding. What emerges is that the elders apparently had no leadership functions within the tribe, but probably only within its subdivisions, though Lemche believes that because the elders sit in the gate, they are of no consequence for nomadism in any event, and he concludes that there was in fact no sort of dominion at all within the tribe.[46] This view may be accurate if one understands the "head" of a tribe as functioning perhaps only as a temporary *primus inter pares* (cf. Jephthah in Jgs. 10:18; 11:8,9,11). De Vaux suggests the title *nāśî'* for the tribal leader.[47]

Two peculiarities should be mentioned in passing. First, the designation "tribe of Levi" represents a learned theological construction as found in Deuteronomy (10:8; 18:1), in P (Nu. 18:2), and in 1 Ch. 23:14, i.e., in exclusively late texts. The second is the idea that the punishment of the Benjaminites after the abomination of Gibeah resulted in "one tribe being cut off from Israel" (Jgs. 21:3,6,17) and that Yahweh thereby created a "breach in the tribes of Israel" (21:15). This statement is noteworthy because it presupposes the closed and unalterable nature of the fixed entity "the tribes of Israel" and traces this entity back to Yahweh's explicit will.

III. Religious Usage.

1. *Yahweh's Natural Order.* We find ourselves on the periphery of religious usage when *šēḇeṭ* is not yet attributed to Yahweh, or at least not directly, something applying to the especially gentle beating of various harvest produce because God's miraculous wisdom has so determined it (Isa. 28:27-29). Job 37:13 speaks similarly if a bit more directly when Yahweh brings up the clouds as his "rod" or "love" *(ḥeseḏ)* in that they as his tools can either punish or enrich human beings by raining in a timely fashion or too much or at the wrong time.[48]

2. *Yahweh as Disciplinarian.* This view already moves a considerable way toward understanding Yahweh as a disciplinarian.[49] It is he who has the Assyrians strike the ruler of Israel upon the cheek (probably the king, Mic. 4:14[5:1]), and he who calls Assyria the "rod of my anger" (Isa. 10:5). The author of Lamentations felt the "rod of God's wrath" (3:1), and Job asks God to "take his rod away from me" (Job 9:34), lamenting that "no rod of God" strikes the houses of the wicked (21:9). The oracle of Nathan prophesies that if David deviates from the commandments, he will be disciplined with the "human rod" (2 S. 7:14).[50] The psalmist in Ps. 89:33(32) also has God declare: "I will punish their transgression with the rod," and according to Isa. 11:4 the tyrant is struck with the "rod of his mouth," an image referring to God's word in its capacity as a "dynamic power."[51] It is uncertain whether the "staff" or "rod" in this expression refers

---

46. Lemche, 279-80.

47. *AncIsr,* 8.

48. See G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 482.

49. See also Gosan 23: "divine rod of discipline" (Beyer, 700).

50. → IX, 208.

51. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 477; cf. also Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12,* 257-58: "the power of the creative word of God and of the prophet."

to the royal scepter as in Ps. 45:7(6),[52] for when Yahweh smites his enemies with a "rod of iron" (2:9), the reference is similarly to a rod of discipline, albeit a particularly painful one.

The image of the rod or staff can also be used in announcing a salvific future for Israel. God breaks the "staff of rulers" (Isa. 14:5) or the rod of "their oppressor" (Isa. 9:3[4]), and destroys "those who holds the scepters" of Beth-eden or Ashkelon (Am. 1:5,8), thus removing all foreign oppression from his people.

3. *Yahweh as Shepherd.* The image of the shepherd is also applied to Yahweh. The petitioner in Ps. 23 predicates him as "my shepherd" (v. 10), explaining that God's rod and staff constantly protect the petitioner and offer beneficent guidance and comfort (v. 4). A postexilic prayer asks God to intervene on behalf of his community with the words: "Shepherd your people with your staff" (Mic. 7:14). Finally, Yahweh's selective judgment during the return from exile is described as a "passing under the staff" (Ezk. 20:37).[53]

4. *Election by Yahweh.* A new, theologically independent complex of statements involves the overall theme "election by Yahweh," since all the tribes of Israel can appear as the objects of such acts and then even be called the "tribes of Yahweh" (Ps. 122:4), though an individual tribe can be adduced from the totality of tribes, such as the tribe of Judah (Ps. 78:68) or that of Levi (Dt. 10:8), or even an individual clan such as that of Eli (1 S. 2:28), or Mt. Zion (Ps. 78:68), or a city, namely, Jerusalem (Dt. 12:5,14; 1 K. 8:16; 11:32; 14:21; 2 K. 21:7; 2 Ch. 6:5; 12:13; 33:7). Yahweh's elective actions in this context always amount to selecting or choosing an object from within the entity of the tribes of Israel.

Yahweh's salvific acts as manifested in the figure of the Servant of Yahweh include among other things also "raising up the tribes of Jacob and restoring the survivors of Israel" (Isa. 49:6). (The concepts "for the tribes of Jacob are in distress" or "the tribes of Jacob passed through in his interior" seem to derive from this context.)[54]

A somewhat more recent psalm petition asks God to remember his congregation, the "tribe of your heritage" (Ps. 74:2). The same expression, now in the pl. *šiḇṭê naḥᵃlāṯeḵā,* occurs in Isa. 63:17 parallel with "your servants." It too is part of a petition asking Yahweh to return. The expression recurs as "tribe of his inheritance" in Jer. 10:16 and 51:19, where it clearly refers to Israel in the sense that the creator of the world is the God who made Israel his possession.

5. *Messianic Interpretation.* The Balaam vision of the rising scepter from Jacob is worth reexamining here (Nu. 24:17). Even though I said above that the reference may be to David quite independent of whether one understands the verse as *vaticinium ex*

---

54. So Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 477.
53. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 416.
54. Beyer, 332-34.

eventu[55] or, given its allusive metaphorical style and lack of concreteness with regard to specific circumstances, as a genuine prophecy regarding the rise of David, one should in any event point out that this image of the "scepter out of Jacob" has over the course of exegetical history been understood messianically (LXX already translates *šēḇeṭ* as *ánthrōpos*) just as was the statement from the Judah oracle in Gen. 49:10: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah till its ruler [*šîlōh* here, of course, interpreted as *mōšᵉlô*] comes."

IV. Qumran. The use of *šēḇeṭ* in the Qumran writings closely follows the OT.

1. *Tribe.* The tribe is the largest organizational unit of the people, whose subdivisions are the clans (1QSa 1:15). "Leaders of the tribes" are mentioned (1QSa 1:29; cf. 1QM 2:3; 4QMᵈ 1,2), and the number of tribes, of course, is twelve (1QM 2:3 par. 4QMᵈ 5-6; 1QM 3:14; 11QT 21:2; cf. also 4QMᵃ 1-3, 8-9; 11QT 18:16), which includes "all the tribes of Israel" (1QM 2:7). One feature typical of Qumran is that in times of war strong men are chosen from all the tribes (2:7), field standards are inscribed with the names of the tribal princes (3:14-15 par. 4QM ᶠ 10:5-6; cf. also 5:1-2). The third standard reads "tribes of God" (4:10; cf. "tribes of Yahweh," Ps. 122:4). The cavalry contingents are also organized according to tribes (6:11), something that in 11QT 21:2 and 18:16 also applies to certain sacrificial materials.

The tribes of the priests are also part of the chosen objects (11QT 60:10; cf. Dt. 18:6). Finally, the term *šēḇeṭ* is also attested in an apostasy regulation composed of clichés from Lev. 16; Dt. 13; 17:2-13; 18:9-22 (4Q375 I, 5,7,8). On the whole, however, "the use of *šēḇeṭ* (14 more times in 1QM) clearly recedes in the Temple scroll (3 times) behind *maṭṭeh*."[56]

2. *Messianic Interpretation.* Commensurate with their theology, however, the Qumranites' real interest is in what are known as the messianic prophecies in the OT; this interest presupposes that Yahweh chose the tribe of Judah and made a covenant with David (4QDibHamᵃ 1-2, IV, 5-6; cf. Ps. 78:68,70-71). Hence 4Q252 (4QpGenᵃ) V, 1 alters the text of Gen. 49:10 to "a ruler *(šallîṭ)* shall not depart from the tribe of Judah," and the verse "from Judah shall come the anointed, the seed of David," is interpreted messianically. 4QpIsaᵈ 1:7 also interprets Isa. 54:11-12 as a reference to the tribal heads at the end of days.

Nu. 24:17 is the verse most frequently subjected to messianic interpretation. Both 1QM 11:6-7 and 4QTest 12 interpret it as referring to their own contemporary circumstances. CD 7:19-20 interprets more specifically: "The star is the interpreter of the Law who shall come to Damascus . . . the scepter is the prince of the whole congregation." Finally, 1QSb 5:23-27 directly addresses the Qumran community: "May the Lord raise you up to everlasting heights. . . . May you . . ravage the earth with your

---

55. See E. Osswald, "Zum Problem der *vaticinia ex eventu*," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 27-44.
56. H.-J. Fabry, → מטה *maṭṭeh*, VIII, 249.

scepter; may you bring death to the ungodly with the breath of your lips" (both allude to Isa. 11:4), "for God has established you as the scepter over the rulers," formulated following Nu. 24:17. In Qumran the fulfillment of messianic expectation is proclaimed as imminent, with the "scepter" symbolizing divine-royal power and divinely effected dominion.

Zobel

שָׁבַע *šāḇaʿ*; שְׁבֻעָה *šᵉḇuʿâ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Oath and Curse. III. Distribution. IV. Niphal with a Person as Subject: 1. With *bᵉ*; 2. As a Metaphor for Belonging to a God; 3. Covenant; 4. Other Promissory Oaths; 5. Vows; 6. Assertory Oaths; 7. False Swearing; 8. Other Considerations. V. The Niphal with God as the Subject: 1. With *bᵉ*; 2. Peculiarities in the Deuteronomistic History; 3. Irrevocability; 4. Oath of Election to David; 5. Punitive Oaths in the Deuteronomistic History; 6. Promises to the Fathers. VI. Hiphil: 1. Factitive Meaning; 2. "Place Someone under a Curse"; 3. Implore, Adjure; 4. Assertory Use; 5. Curses in Determining the Truth. VII. *šᵉḇuʿâ*: 1. Content of an Oath; 2. Oath; 3. Curse; 4. *šᵉḇuʿaṯ yhwh/ʾᵉlōhîm*. VIII. Qumran. IX. LXX.

šāḇaʿ. R. Achenbach, *Israel zwischen Verheissung und Gebot. EH Theologie* 422 (1991); S. H. Blank, "The Curse, Blasphemy, the Spell, and the Oath," *HUCA* 23 (1950/51) 73-95; H. C. Brichto, *The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible. JBLMS* 13 (1963); H. S. Gehman, "The Oath in the OT," *Grace upon Grace. FS L. J. Kuyper* (Grand Rapids, 1975), 51-63; G. Giesen, "Semantische Vorfragen zur Wurzel שׁבע 'schwören,'" *Bausteine biblischer Theologie. FS G. J. Botterweck. BBB* 50 (1977), 127-43; idem, *Die Wurzel šbʿ "schwören." BBB* 56 (1981); idem, "Eid," *NBL*, 488-89; J. Hehn, "Zur Bedeutung der Siebenzahl," *Vom AT. FS K. Marti. BZAW* 41 (1925), 128-36; idem, *Siebenzahl und Sabbat bei den Babyloniern und im AT. LSSt* II/5 (1907); F. Horst, "Der eid im AT," *EvT* 17 (1957) 366-84 = *Gottes Recht. ThB* 12 (1961), 292-314; C. A. Keller, "שׁבע *šbʿ* ni. to swear," *TLOT*, III, 1292-97; M. A. Klopfenstein, *Die Lüge nach dem AT* (Zurich, 1964); I. Kottsieper, "Zur Etymologie von hebr. *šbʿ* I," *UF* 22 (1990) 149-68; B. Lang, "Das Verbot des Meineids im Dekalog," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 161 (1981) 97-105; M. R. Lehmann, "Biblical Oaths," *ZAW* 81 (1969) 74-92; J. S. Licht, "שְׁבוּעָה," *EMiqr*, VII, 479-94, 719-20; N. Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid. SBS* 28 (1967); D. L. Magnetti, "The Oath in the OT in the Light of Related Terms and in the Legal and Covenantal Context of the Ancient Near East" (diss., Johns Hopkins, 1969); D. J. McCarthy, "Three Covenants in Genesis," *CBQ* 26 (1964) 179-89; idem, *Treaty and Covenant. AnBibl* 21A (1978); G. E. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Pittsburgh, 1955); N. Oswald, "Eid III. Judentum," *TRE*, IX, 377-79; J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten in seinem Verhältnis zu verwandten Erscheinungen sowie die Stellung des Eides im Islam. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des islamischen Orients* 3 (1914); M. H. Pope, "Oaths," *IDB*, III, 575-77; I. M. Price, "The Oath in Court Procedure in Early Babylonia and the OT," *JAOS* 49 (1929) 22-29; E. Qimron, "שבועת הבנים in the Damascus Document 15.1-2," *JQR* 81 (1990/91) 115-18; T. Römer, *Israels Väter. OBO* 99 (1990); L. H. Schiffman, "The Law of Vows and Oaths (Num. 30,3-16) in the Zadokite Fragments and the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 15 (1991/92) 199-214; H. Seebass, "Eid II. AT," *TRE* IX, 376-77; G. M. Tucker, "Contracts in the OT" (diss., Yale,

I. Etymology. Because of the phonemic ambiguity of the Hebrew root *šbʿ* and the fact that Hebraists have overlooked important South Semitic parallels, no consensus has yet emerged with respect to its etymology. In particular, derivation from the numeral *šeḇaʿ*, "seven,"[1] is countered by association with Arab. *sabaʿa*, "curse,"[2] whereby the Arab. root is occasionally associated with the magical connotation "seven."[3] Within the Aramaic linguistic sphere, the root occurs only in Jewish Aramaic, where the ithpaal corresponds to Hebrew niphal and the aphel can mean not only "swear" but also "adjure."[4] Such usage also corresponds to Samaritan Aramaic,[5] whereas Mandaic attests only the causative stem as a technical term for "adjure."[6] Because older Aramaic, Syriac, and Neo-Aramaic attest only the root *ymʾ*, however, from which Akk. *wamāʾu, māmītu* is inseparable, and because the adduced witnesses all occur within the Hebrew sphere of influence, they are to be viewed as Hebraisms.

Finally, one might adduce Jibbali, which attests the causative *esbaʿ*, "swear," and the corresponding reflexives *sótbaʿ* and *šsbaʿ*.[7] Because the Jibbali sound designated by *s* suggests a loan relationship with Arabic, however, one would have to begin with the existence of a corresponding root in Arabic. There only Arab. *sabaʿa*, "curse, revile,"[8] can be considered, etymologically related to Geʿez *sbʿ*, "bewitch."[9] This relationship is supported by the fact that Arab. *ʾalā*, "curse," also means "swear" in the fourth stem, and because the Geez suggests that a magical connotation attaches to *šbʿ*, which also becomes clear in the meaning of the hiphil, "implore, adjure," as also borrowed by Ara-

---

1963); idem, "Covenant Forms and Contract Forms," *VT* 15 (1965) 487-503; T. C. Vriezen, "Eid," *BHHW*, I, 374-76.

On the oath in Israel's surroundings: T. Canaan, "Der Schwur bei den palästinischen Arabern," *SBFLA* 12 (1962) 113-22; D. O. Edzard, "Zum sumerischen Eid," *Sumerological Studies. FS T. Jacobsen. AS* 20 (1975) 63-98; A. Falkenstein, *Die neusumerischen Gerichtsurkunden. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Phil.-hist. Kl. N.S. 39 (1956); H. Hirsch, *Untersuchungen zur altassyrischen Religion. BAfO* 13-14 (1961); V. Korošec, *Hethitische Staatsverträge. Leipziger Rechtswissenschaftliche Studien* 60 (Leipzig, 1931); P. Kaplony, "Eid," *LexÄg*, I, 1188-1200; N. Oettinger, *Die Militärischen Eide der Hethiter. Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten* 22 (1976); M. San Nicolò, "Eid," *RLA*, II, 305-15; P. Steinkeller, *Sale Documents of the Ur-III-Period. Freiburg altorientalische Studien* 17 (Wiesbaden, 1989); J. A. Wilson, "The Oath in Ancient Egypt," *JNES* 7 (1948) 129-56; → אלה *ʾālâ (ʾālāh)*; → ברית *bᵉrîṯ*; → נדר *nāḏar*.

1. E.g., Lehmann, 78-80.
2. E.g., Pedersen, 5.
3. E.g., W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 483; E. Littmann, *Der Islam* 7 (1917) 138; V. Christian, *Untersuchungen zur Laut- und Formenlehre des Hebräischen. Sitzungsberichte des Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien.* Phil.-hist. Kl. 228/2 (1953) 174.
4. J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls* (Jerusalem, 1985), 278; Beyer, 701.
5. R. Macuch, *Grammatik des samaritanischen Aramäisch* (Berlin, 1982), 154, 226, 228.
6. Kottsieper, 155-56.
7. T. M. Johnstone, *Jibbāli Lexicon* (Oxford, 1981), 221.
8. Kottsieper, 160.
9. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez*, 483.

maic. Comparison with Egyptian, where the numeric root "seven" is *śfḫ*,[10] but where one also encounters *śbh*, "cry out, lament, express oneself loudly (and negatively),"[11] which cannot be dissociated from Arab. *sabaʿa*, "curse, revile," clearly shows that the underlying root here cannot be associated etymologically with the numerical root.

Nor is Arab. *sabaʿa*, "tear, bite," etymologically related, since it probably belongs to a root which in New Egyptian appears as *sbḫ*, "cover, mount."[12] The Sabaic witnesses adduced by Kottsieper[13] probably also belong to this root, as shown by an inscription discovered at the beginning of 1992.[14]

Hence Heb. *šbʿ* niphal derives from a root that in its fundamental Semitic-Hamitic meaning has a strong and especially negative connotation, one which, as shown by Arabic, was able to develop into a verb of aggression meaning "curse, revile," whence the meaning "swear" developed from the reflexive nature of the niphal such that the use of the word connoted self-imprecation when making a vow or oath. The occurrence of the meaning "implore, adjure" in the hiphil during the post-OT period as well shows that the root did not lose this magical-religious element (cf. also Geʿez).

II. Oath and Curse. The results of the etymological investigation prompt the question of the relationship between the oath or vow and the curse. Just how strongly the root *šbʿ* still connotes "curse" can be seen not only from the passages discussed below,[15] but also from the fact that Isa. 65:16 introduces the hithpael of *brk*, "bless oneself," as the antithesis to *šbʿ* niphal.

Comparisons with the understanding of oaths both in the OT and in its milieu, however, also show the direct relationship between the oath and self-imprecation.[16] The root *'lh* also shows that the meanings "swear" and "curse" were perceived as related in Hebrew, and Akk. *māmītu* refers simultaneously to an oath as well as to both the imprecatory power released by transgression and the imprecation itself, in which case it can parallel *arratu*, "curse."[17] The connection between oath and curse is so strong in Akkadian that the term for oath, *nīšu*, deriving from the vow formula *nīš* X, "life of X," and thus originally having no relationship with the curse, can become a term for curse and accordingly be used alongside *māmītu*.[18] The same relationship emerges with the Semitic root *ḥlp*, which in Sabaic and Arabic can also mean "swear" and yet in Geʿez "curse."

---

10. *WbÄS*, IV, 115.
11. Ibid., 90-91.
12. Ibid., 93; Kottsieper, 161.
13. Kottsieper, 156ff.
14. Schm/Mārib 28; forthcoming publication by N. Nebes, *Archäologische Beiträge* from Yemen.
15. VI.2, 5; VII.3.
16. Cf. J. Hempel, "Die israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen," *ZDMG* 79 (1925) 44-47 = *Apoxysmata. Vorarbeiten zu einer Religionsgeschichte und Theologie des AT. BZAW* 81 (1961), 51-55; Kottsieper, 162-66.
17. Cf. Pedersen, 70-72; Brichto, 72-74.
18. E.g., Šurpu V-VI, 67, 77.

Not only the use of the word itself makes clear that the oath was understood as a self-imprecation, but also the accompanying actions make this evident. EnEl VI 97 explicitly designates the oath of the gods as a self-imprecation: *ú-za-ki-ru-ma a-na ra-ma-ni-šú-nu a-ra-ru,* "they pronounced on themselves a curse." Line 98 underscores this self-threat through the gesture of seizing the throat, a gesture attested particularly also in Mari.[19]

Hittite military oaths similarly contain imprecations against those who break the oath (Oettinger). The Sumerian designation *nam-erím-ku₅*, used especially in assertory oaths with the meaning "cut someone an evil *NAM*,"[20] suggests that through the oath the oath giver now stands under a kind of qualified curse.

This notion also clearly emerges in the OT when an oath is introduced with the formula *kōh ya'ᵃśeh lᵉ-'ᵉlōhîm/yhwh wᵉḵōh yôsîp* (e.g., 1 S. 14:44; 20:13; 25:22; 2 S. 3:9,35; 19:14[Eng. 13]; 1 K. 2:23; 2 K. 6:31; Ruth 1:17; cf. also 1 S. 3:17). Scholars generally agree that the oath formulation with *'im* ultimately derives from such a qualified self-imprecation,[21] and Jgs. 21:18 even cites an explicit curse as an oath (cf. also Ps. 7:4-6[3-5]; 137:5-6).

These observations along with etymological considerations show that the transfer of the imprecatory element in sworn vows onto oaths in the larger sense made it possible for *šb'* to take on the meaning of oath, with the attendant element of self-imprecation remaining strongly preserved and thus the oath itself being evoked in all its gravity.

III. Distribution. The root *šb'* occurs 155 times in the niphal and 30 times each in the hiphil and the derived subst. *qaṭūl.* Because in Josh. 23:7 the substance of the preceding *lō'-ṯazkîrû* suggests a following *šb'* niphal (cf. the paralleling of *šb'* niphal and *zkr* hiphil in Isa. 48:1), one is advised to read a niphal here following the Pesh., Tgs., and Vg.

Of the 30 occurrences of the derived substantive, 29 are feminine *(šᵉḇu'â);* the only masculine occurrence is found in the incomprehensible combination *šᵉḇu'ê šᵉḇu'ôṯ* in Ezk. 21:28(23). Alongside Ezk. 16:8, this passage is the only witness for *šb'* in this book. In this context 16:8 apparently uses a traditional formulation in reference to the marriage alliance — elsewhere Ezekiel prefers the root *'lh* or different vow formulae; cf. v. 6. Hence 21:28(23) probably represents a later insertion whose meaning is yet unclear.

The obvious association of *šb'* with magical-religious elements of self-imprecation in connection with oaths probably explains why with the exception of Eccl. 8:2 and 9:2, wisdom writings, which exhibit hardly any interest in such topics, do not use this root at all. Most of the occurrences (151) are found in narrative literature, where one also encounters most oaths. One finds 43 occurrences in the prophetic books (including

---

19. *ARM,* I, 37, 20; II, 62, 9; 77, 11; XIII, 147, 7, et passim; cf. also *ANET,* 503.

20. Edzard, 77.

21. C. van Leeuwen, "Die Partikel אִם," *Syntax and Meaning. Studies in Hebrew Syntax and Biblical Exegesis. OTS* 18 (1973), 34-38; on the corresponding use of Akk. *šumma,* see W. Farber, "Wehe, wenn . . . !," *ZA* 64 (1975) 177-79.

Dnl. 12), with 30 in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Amos. Finally, 13 occurrences are found in the Psalms, to which one can add 5 in Canticles, though the latter actually refer to the beloved "adjuring" her friends.[22] One should emphasize that God is the subject of *šbʿ* niphal in 75 passages, 40 of which are found in the Dtr History. By contrast, God never appears as the subject of *šbʿ* hiphil.

Associated with *šbʿ* niphal/hiphil, *bᵉ* can indicate which deity is being invoked. And in relation to *šbʿ* niphal, a person is the subject 28 times[23] and God 13 (all of which are found outside the Dtr History).[24] Instances of *šbʿ* hiphil include Gen. 24:3; 1 K. 2:42; 2 Ch. 36:13; Neh. 13:25; Cant. 2:7; 3:5.

The observation that oaths with *šbʿ* niphal are introduced only 18 times with *ʾim (lōʾ)* (Gen. 21:23; Nu. 32:10-11; Dt. 1:34-35; Josh. 14:9; 1 S. 3:14; 19:6; 24:22[21]; 28:10; 30:15; 1 K. 1:51; 2:8; Ps. 95:11; 132:2-4; Isa. 14:24; 62:8; Jer. 38:16; 44:26; Am. 8:7) does not allow the conclusion that the oaths with *šbʿ* must not always be associated with self-imprecation.[25] Etymological findings show that *šbʿ* alone already connotes this element, so that the relatively rare use of this formula is actually explained by the meaning of *šbʿ* itself having made it superfluous. Commensurately only two (of 10) occurrences of the self-imprecatory formula *kōh yaʿᵃśeh-lî ʾᵉlōhîm/yhwh wᵉḵōh yôsîp̄* use *šbʿ* (2 S. 3:35; 1 K. 2:23).

IV. Niphal with a Person as Subject.

1. *With bᵉ.* Of the 80 occurrences of *šbʿ* niphal with a person as its subject, in 28 the prep. *bᵉ* indicates with whom the oath is made. Passages without *bᵉ* that refer to passages with *bᵉ* (Gen. 24:9, cf. v. 3; Josh. 6:22, cf. 2:12; 9:15,20 + 2 S. 21:2 [cf. Josh. 9:19]; Jgs. 21:1,18, cf. v. 7; 1 S. 24:23[22], cf. v. 22[21]; 1 K. 1:13, cf. vv. 17,30) show that the formulation with *bᵉ* does not refer to a special kind of vow over against passages without *bᵉ*. To these one might add the passages containing a corresponding oath formula such as *ḥay/ḥê* or *kōh yaʿᵃśeh* (1 S. 19:6; 20:3; 2 S. 3:35; 1 K. 1:29; 2:23-24; Jer. 4:2; 5:2; 38:16; Hos. 4:15). Josh. 9:15; Jgs. 21:1; and 1 K. 1:13 in particular, all of which refer to an oath that one only learns later was sworn by God (Josh. 9:19; Jgs. 21:7; 1 K. 1:17,30), show that even without an explicit indication with *bᵉ*, *šbʿ* niphal refers to swearing by invoking a divine power.

An overview of passages with *bᵉ* shows that when Israelites swore, they did so by the God of Israel. Yahweh is mentioned by name 10 times (Josh. 2:12; 9:19; Jgs. 21:7; 1 S. 24:22[21]; 28:10; 2 S. 19:8[7]; 1 K. 1:17,30; 2:8,23), with *ʾᵉlōhê yiśrāʾēl* added in Josh. 9:19 and 1 K. 1:30; in 7 passages a person swears by his name *(šēm)* (Lev. 19:12; Dt. 6:13; 10:20; 1 S. 20:42; Isa. 48:1; Jer. 12:16a; Zech. 5:4; cf. also Josh. 23:7 in reference to other gods); in 3 passages the reference is *bēʾlōhîm* (Gen. 21:23; 1 S. 30:15; Ps. 63:12[11], originally *yhwh*). A unique formulation appears in Isa. 65:16 with *bēʾlōhê ʾāmēn,* though the vocalization *ʾēmûn* seems more likely, with the corresponding trans-

22. See VI.3 below.
23. See IV.1 below.
24. See V.1 below.
25. See Giesen, *Wurzel,* 26.

lation "by the God of faithfulness." The angelic messenger in Dnl. 12:7 reinforces his revelation with the oath "by the one who lives forever *(beḥê hāʿôlām)*." The invocative character of the oath comes to expression when the messenger raises both hands in a gesture of prayer (cf. also Gen. 14:22; Dt. 32:40). Finally, Jacob swears by *paḥaḏ ʾāḇîw yiṣḥāq* (Gen. 31:53).

Josh. 23:7; Jer. 5:7; 12:16; Am. 8:14; and Zeph. 1:5 all mention foreign gods in connection with oaths, while Jer. 5:7 introduces them with *belōʾ ʾelōhîm.*

In Am. 8:14 *ʾašmaṯ (šōmerôn)* is frequently emended to *ʾašimaṯ* or *ʾašēraṯ* in order to preserve the name of a god. Yet even if one maintains the text,[26] the parallelism with *ḥê ʾelōheyḵā* clearly shows that the reference is to swearing by a certain god. Zeph. 1:5 has *bemalkām,* which LXX^{L} reads as *Melchou,* prompting frequent emendation of the MT. If one maintains the MT, then the statement refers to Baʿal (cf. also Jer. 12:16), mentioned in v. 4. In any event, here too the reference is to swearing by a foreign god.

Ps. 102:9(8), where the petitioner laments that his enemies swear "by" him, does not fit this context. The ensuing life description beginning with *kî,* however, suggests that the enemies are using the unfortunate fate of the petitioner as an imprecatory example, just as the adulteress in Nu. 5:21 and 27 becomes a curse *(ʾālâ)* and a *šeḇuʿâ.* Isa. 65:15 and Jer. 29:22 also illustrate that a person could mention negative examples when cursing. Hence the petitioner in Ps. 102:9(8) could be mentioned — and not in an ironic way — as a divine guarantor of the oath.[27]

The observation that only deities are introduced with *be* as guarantors of oaths with *šbʿ* niphal is all the more significant because other oath formulations are attested that, for example, mention the king or priest (Gen. 42:15-16; 1 S. 1:26; 17:55; 2 S. 11:11; 14:19). In the *ḥay/ḥê* formula one can also mention the oath taker as well as God (1 S. 20:3; 25:26; 2 S. 15:21; 2 K. 2:2; 4:30; etc.). Apparently *šbʿ* niphal + *be* means more than the simple formulation of an oath with *ḥay/ḥê* (cf. also 1 K. 22:14-17).[28] This formulation indicates that those who take the oath place themselves under a divine power that will guarantee the efficacy of the self-imprecation accompanying the oath.

These findings accord with Steinkeller's observation that Sum. *nam-erím-ku$_5$* and Akk. *māmītu,* both of which connote imprecatory power, have stronger meaning than the oath terms *mu-X-pad,* "pronounce the name of X," or *nīšu,* "life, oath," through which the same aspect comes to expression as in the formula with *ḥay/ḥê.*[29]

Gen. 31:53 makes clear that the normal situation is for the personal deity to be invoked. Although the family gods of the two are invoked as guarantors of the contract between Jacob and Nahor, Jacob does de facto swear only by the God of his father Isaac (though cf. the addendum *ʾelōheyḵā* in 1 K. 1:17).

Even if, as is customary, one assigns Gen. 31:53a and b to two different sources,[30]

---

26. E.g., with H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 331-32.
27. See Giesen, *Wurzel,* 19, 34.
28. See VI.4 below.
29. Steinkeller, 76-77.
30. But cf. the different position of E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte. WMANT* 57 (1984), 139 n. 38.

the fact remains that Jacob swears to this two-sided contract only by his God. The Elephantine texts also consistently attest Jews swearing by their gods Yahweh, Ḥerem, or Anathyahu.[31] Other texts make clear in a negative way that those making self-determined oaths invoked their own gods. In one text,[32] although the Jewish woman Mibṭaḥya[33] swears by the Egyptian goddess Satis, the text does point out that this oath was imposed on her by the court in Syene, probably at the prompting of her Egyptian opponent.[34]

2. *As a Metaphor for Belonging to a God.* Hence the expression *nišba' b^e^yhwh/ b^e^šēm yhwh* could become a metaphor for belonging to Yahweh and his devotees. Dtr preaching accordingly inculcates not only service *('bd)* and fear *(yr')*, but also (and with almost the same wording) swearing by the name of Yahweh (Dt. 6:13; 10:20). Dt. 6:12 contrasts such swearing with its opposite, namely, that a person forgets God. A similar warning is found in Josh. 23:7.

Portraying the future when the people's relationship with God will be intact, Isa. 65:16 mentions among other things that at that time people will swear by the true God. By contrast, Jer. 5:7, in portraying the people's disloyalty, claims that they have sworn "by those who are no gods," and Zeph. 1:5 also uses swearing by a different god as a metaphor for apostasy from Yahweh (cf. in this regard also Am. 8:14). Jer. 12:16 combines the positive and negative elements by employing the oath of the nations to Yahweh as a sign of veneration after they first made Israel itself fall away from Yahweh, as evoked by the image of swearing by Ba'al. Based on this usage, *šb' + b^e^* then came to express belonging to the people of God, as attested in Isa. 48:1 in *parallelismus membrorum* with *bē'lōhê yiśrā'ēl yazkîrû.*

Ps. 63:12(11) uses this metaphor in a unique way by associating *hammeleḵ* and *kol-hannišbā' bô (= bē'lōhîm)* through *parallelismus membrorum.* Those who swear by God can, like the king, be assured of God's succor and hence be glad even amid tribulations.

Jer. 4:2 views swearing by God as a sign of repentance, though here *ḥay yhwh* replaces the formulation with *b^e^*. This formulation also appears in Hos. 4:15, where it expresses Yahweh's cultic veneration in Beth-aven.

The two occurrences in Isa. 19:18 and 45:23 with *nišba' l^e^* in the sense of submission or conversion to God are to be distinguished from *šb'* niphal + *b^e^* + DN as a metaphor for belonging to the particular god. The context of Isa. 45:23 is the turning of the nations to God, which turning comes to expression in the confession that only in Yahweh can righteousness and strength be found. Here the nations swear this confession with a gesture of submission *(lî tiḵra' kol-bereḵ).*

The late addendum in Isa. 19:18 is less clear. Here it is predicted that on the day of

31. *AP* 6.4,6,11; 44.2-3; 45.4; concerning the reading of 44.2-3, see B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt,* II (Jerusalem, 1989), 146.

32. *AP* 14.5.

33. On her background see, e.g., *AP* 8.2-3; 9.3-4; 20.3.

34. See 14.3-5.

judgment for Egypt, five cities will exist there that speak the language of Canaan and *nišbāʻôṯ lᵉyhwh.* In the light of Isa. 45:23, however, this verse probably means that they turned to God through an oath; i.e., the five cities refer not to Diaspora Jews but to Egyptian proselytes.

3. *Covenant.* Scholars have on many occasions observed that contracts in the ancient Near East consistently take the form of an oath in the sense of a qualified self-imprecation.[35] Hence it comes as no surprise that 14 occurrences (over 15 percent) are found in connection with the making of a covenant or allude to such. This context also includes the Dtn-Dtr interpretation of the covenant with the fathers and the land promise as an oath made by God.[36] Gen. 21:22-24,27, and 34 recount that Abimelech asked Abraham to "swear to me here by God that you will not deal falsely with me" (v. 23). Just as in the Old Aramaic Sefire texts,[37] this agreement is also to apply to subsequent generations ("or with my offspring or with my posterity," v. 23). That precisely in this context *šbʻ* niphal (v. 24) is used makes clear that the process thus described invokes a power able to guarantee such agreements even into the future. The process is then described in v. 27, however, with the words *wayyiḵrᵉṯû šᵉnêhem bᵉrîṯ,* indicating the complete equivalence of *kāraṯ bᵉrîṯ* and *nišbaʻ.*

A later hand then takes a cue from v. 32, which displaces the action to Beer-sheba, and introduces an "etymology" of the place name in v. 31 playing off the formulation describing the covenant itself as an oath. E. Blum is correct in suggesting that v. 34 points to a Philistine setting for the making of the covenant, with which v. 32 does not accord.[38] In that case, and against prevailing opinion, v. 34 must be viewed as part of the original narrative, with v. 31 added at earliest when the story became associated with Beer-sheba.

The parallel account in Gen. 26:26-31 describes the situation analogously. Here v. 31 formulates the making of the covenant *(kāraṯ bᵉrîṯ,* v. 28) as *wayyiššāḇᵉʻû ʼîš lᵉʼāḥîw.* Gen. 31:43-54 also juxtaposes *kāraṯ bᵉrîṯ* (v. 44) and *šbʻ* niphal (v. 53), albeit in different strata, showing that *šbʻ* niphal by itself was perfectly capable of referring to the making of a covenant.

The dispute with the Gibeonites in Josh. 9 shows that it was the element of the oath that bestowed unrestricted validity upon a covenant that remained in force even if the oath was attained under pretense and false information; here the Gibeonites get a peace treaty with Joshua that he cannot annul even after discovering the deception. The ad-

---

35. From the immense literature on this topic, one might note (in addition to → ברית *bᵉrîṯ*) the studies of McCarthy, Mendenhall, and Tucker. M. Weinfeld also offers considerable material in "The Loyalty Oath in the Ancient Near East," *UF* 8 (1976) 379-414. Concerning Israel's milieu, cf. alongside Oettinger and Korošec also the collection of Assyrian contracts in S. Parpola and K. Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties and Loyalty Oaths. State Archives of Assyria* 2 (Helsinki, 1988).

36. See V.6 below.

37. *KAI* 222-24; cf. also the Assyrian contracts in Parpola and Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties,* 2; 6; 10.

38. Blum, *Komposition,* 411.

dendum in vv. 15b and 18-21 explains these circumstances in greater detail, adducing as the key element that the leaders of the congregation had sworn an oath to the Gibeonites (v. 15b). It is then this oath that prevents the Gibeonites from being killed (v. 18), and the elders adduce it when sparing the Gibeonites from the angry people (vv. 19-20), emphasizing that the oath was sworn by Yahweh and that any breach would thus conjure up (divine) wrath *(qeṣep)*. The association of *šb'* niphal with the evocation of divine punitive power is unequivocal here.

Although Giesen, among others, has suggested that historically in a political covenant the stronger party did not just swear an oath to the weaker, this misses the point of the narrative, which is merely to explain the special treatment enjoyed by the Gibeonites.[39] The mention of an oath made by the Gibeonites had no function in this story and could thus be omitted. 2 S. 21:2b clearly attests the diachronic validity of such a covenantal oath in that it confirms Saul's bloodguilt toward the Gibeonites by citing the oath sworn by the Israelites during the time of Joshua.

In the account of the covenant between Jonathan and David in 1 S. 20:12-17, Jonathan's oath is described as an explicit self-imprecation sworn before God (vv. 12-13), whereas David's own obligation, which also refers expressly to his family, comes about when Jonathan makes him swear (*šb'* hiphil). 1 S. 20:42 uses the formulation *nišba'nû šᵉnênû ᵃnaḥnû bᵉšēm yhwh* in describing this covenant as an oath sworn before God, and in direct discourse then invokes its perpetual validity with regard to future generations as well.

Only the Chronicler, however, describes a covenant with God as an oath designated by *šb'* niphal that the people swear to God; in Deuteronomy such a covenant with God already exhibits elements of an oath on the part of the people through the clause cursing those who break the covenant (Dt. 28:15-68; 30:17-19, invoking heaven and earth). 2 Ch. 15 describes the covenant renewal under Asa not only with the general designation *bô' babbᵉrîṯ* (v. 12), but also as the swearing of an oath to God (vv. 14-15). The people's self-obligation with regard to mixed marriages in Ezra 10:2-5 is described on the one hand as *kāraṯ bᵉrîṯ* (v. 3) and on the other as *nišba'* (v. 5). This context also includes the oath sworn by the petitioner in Ps. 119:106 to observe God's "righteous ordinances."

4. *Other Promissory Oaths.* The unqualified validity of an oath described by *nišba'* also emerges from most of the remaining passages. The stories of Jgs. 21 are based on the Israelites' oath not to give any daughter in marriage to the Benjaminites (vv. 1,7,18). Here one encounters the almost magical component of self-imprecation (cf. the imprecatory formula with *'ārûr* in v. 18) accompanying such oaths, a component that might at most be circumvented but never annulled. According to 1 K. 2:36-46, Solomon is similarly forced to use a circuitous route in revoking his father's oath not to harm Shimei (2 S. 19:24[23]). Such circumvention of an oath required "wisdom," as 1 K. 2:8-9 makes clear. The remaining 10 occurrences of an oath not to harm someone, oaths in which a superior party assures a weaker one not to use power or to take punitive measures, show that this indirect

39. *Wurzel,* 56, 53.

revocation of an oath not to harm someone actually represents an exception that merely confirms the rule that *šb'* niphal generally indicates a reliable promise. The context of Josh. 2:12; Jgs. 15:12; 1 S. 19:6; 28:10; 30:15; and Jer. 38:16 makes clear that the person accepting the oath viewed such assurances as trustworthy, the background being the notion that through that oath a power superior to the person making the oath would guarantee the interests of the weaker party, i.e., of the person accepting the sworn assurance. Hence the person making the oath generally wanted to formulate the oath in as open a form as possible so as not to be committed to unforeseen developments. Solomon accordingly swears an oath to spare Adonijah (1 K. 1:52) only under the condition that the latter remain loyal in the future. That the narrator does indeed have Adonijah prompt Solomon to swear such an oath in v. 51, and yet describes the oath itself only with *'āmar* and the *'im* formula, shows the restraint with which he is using *šb'*. In 1 K. 2:23-24, however, the oath with which Solomon finally does condemn Adonijah to death after the latter transgresses politically yet again is described quite broadly with the self-imprecation *kōh ya'aśeh-lî 'elōhîm wekōh yôsîp* and the *ḥay yhwh* introduction, commencing quite pointedly with *wayyiššāḇa'* . . . *beyhwh*. Gen. 24:5-8 and Josh. 2:17-20 also show that in the formulation of oaths restrictive conditions were both possible and occasionally even necessary in order to avoid unintended consequences.

The positive pendant to the oath not to harm someone is the assurance of a future gift or beneficence guaranteed by an oath. These oaths, too, can be formulated with *nišba'*, underscoring the element of irrevocability. Hence in connection with Joshua's land distribution in Josh. 14:9, Caleb successfully adduces an oath Moses once made, and in 1 K. 1:17 (cf. also v. 13) Bathsheba similarly reminds David of his oath regarding Solomon's succession. The problem attaching to both passages, however, is that nothing is said previously about such an oath, though in the case of the oath to Caleb one might refer back to God's oath (see esp. Dt. 1:36).

The description of the sale of the birthright in Gen. 25:33 using *šb'* niphal shows the irrevocability of the act, since in contrast to a concrete thing this particular right cannot change its actual possessor. One further context involves securing the execution of a commission that the person issuing the commission cannot actually check. Abraham has his servant swear an oath to correctly execute Abraham's commission to find a wife for Isaac but under no circumstances to take Isaac back to the land of Abraham's birth (Gen. 24:2-9). This safeguard is necessary because Abraham is so old (v. 1) that he may not live to see the commission fulfilled. Jacob similarly has Joseph swear an oath to fulfill his last wish, namely, to be buried in Palestine (Gen. 47:31).

In both passages the oath rite includes having the person swearing the oath lay his hand on the genitals of the person requiring the oath (Gen. 24:2,9; 47:29). A similar gesture appears in connection with a messenger in an Old Babylonian letter: *ma-ar ši-ip-ri-ka iš-ki-ya ù i-ša-ri li-iṣ-ba-at-ma lu-di-ku!-um*, "your messenger shall grasp my testicles and my penis, then I will give to you."[40] This parallel shows that this particular

---

40. *VAT*, 12456,12-16; B. Kienast, *Die altbabylonischen Briefe und Urkunden aus Kissura. Freiburger altorientalische Studien* 2/2 (1978), 175.

rite was used to secure an oath especially in connection with private agreements. The person touching the genitals places himself under the enduring power of the person touched, power whose vital continuation is symbolized by the organ of procreation. An analogous Arabic expression in Palestine is: "I lay my hand under your garment," meaning to place oneself under the helping power of someone in a superior position.[41]

5. *Vows.* The transition from promissory oath to vow can be seen in 2 S. 3:35, where David imposes a fast on himself at Abner's burial with an explicit self-imprecation. Ps. 132:1-5 similarly recalls one of David's vows, with v. 2 equating *nāḏar laʾᵃḇîr yaʿᵃqōḇ* with *nišbaʿ lᵉyhwh.* Nu. 30:2-16(1-15), which regulates the validity of positive and negative vows, shows that the choice of the root *šbʿ* for a vow indicates its irrevocability. The positive vow is consistently expressed by the root *ndr,* while vows of denial are rendered in part by *šbʿ* with *ʾsr,* and in part merely with forms of *ʾsr.* It can be no accident that formulations with *šbʿ* niphal in v. 3(2) and with *šᵉḇuʿâ* in v. 11(10) appear only when the conclusion is that the vow remains valid.

A change takes place in v. 14(13), however, in that it also designates a *šᵉḇuʿaṯ ʾissār* as revocable. Since, however, the qualification *lᵉʿannōṯ nāpeš* also appears here — the only occurrence in the entire text — as well as *kol-nēḏer,* which also departs from the rest of the text, which always uses the plural after *kōl,* v. 14 is to be viewed as a summarizing insertion whose editor did not include the considered use of *šbʿ* in his source; accordingly also, v. 15 continues the train of thought of v. 13.

6. *Assertory Oaths.* An assertory oath is described by *šbʿ* niphal in 1 S. 20:3 and 2 S. 19:8(7). Neither passage, however, involves swearing an oath in a legal case (but cf. in this regard Ex. 22:10[11]; Lev. 5:22-24), but rather the confirmation of a statement intended to move the dialogue partner to a change of plans. The particular gravity attaching to the statement made with *nišbaʿ* is attested in that the person addressed is immediately persuaded.

2 S. 21:17, however, leaves the concrete sphere of assertory oaths when David's warriors "swear" that he will no longer go out into battle. This oath can be understood only from the perspective of the connotation of *šbʿ* as a (qualified) curse; by putting themselves under such a curse, David's men force him to give in to their wishes, not least out of consideration for them.

7. *False Swearing.* Commensurate with the gravity attributed to an oath designated by *šbʿ* niphal, one rarely hears about perjury described with the addition of *laššeqer* (Lev. 5:24; 19:12; Jer. 7:9; Zech. 5:4; Mal. 3:5), *ʿal-šeqer* (Lev. 5:22), and *lᵉmirmâ* (Ps. 24:4). Such false swearing represents not only unsocial behavior toward the person accepting the oath as assurance, but also a transgression against the deity who stands in as the guarantor of the oath. Hence Lev. 19:11-13 mentions swearing falsely together with theft, deception, and exploitation, while Jer. 7:9 views it together with theft, mur-

41. See Canaan, 116.

der, adultery, and the worship of idols. Zech. 5:3-4 views the perjurer together with the thief, Mal. 3:5 with the sorcerers, adulterers, and those who oppress workers. Lev. 19:12 in particular emphasizes that perjury also transgresses against God, equating it with profaning *(ḥillēl)* the name of God. Cf. also CD 15:3 and the particular emphasis on swearing falsely in God's name in Zech. 5:4 and Mal. 3:5, though in the MT the latter passage has lost the expression *bišmî.*[42] Accordingly, the entrance liturgies in Ps. 15 and 24:3-6 demand among other things purity from false swearing, with 24:4 paralleling "those who do not swear deceitfully" with "persons with clean hands."

Ps. 15:4 is to be translated "who swears to the wicked without changing it" (concerning *nišba' lᵉhāra',* cf. also Lev. 5:4). Because the statement has no parallel member, however, one cannot exclude the possibility that v. 4a represents a later insertion, so that vv. 2-3 and 4b constitute a tricolon, or perhaps v. 4b represents the remnant of an original bicolon. In any event it is clear that only those who stand by their oath have access to the sanctuary, though cf. Jer. 7:9-10.

According to Lev. 5:20-26(6:1-7), such false swearing can be atoned only as a sacral transgression. Hence those who have attained someone else's property through a promissory oath must restore that property plus one-fifth and also atone by sacrificing a ram. Here the surcharge of one-fifth value corresponds to the regulations regarding replacement after damage to holy things in the sanctuary and regarding the redemption of a pledge (5:16; 22:14; 27:13,31). Lev. 5:14-19 also mentions rams as guilt offerings in connection with regulations concerning damage to the sanctuary. These findings show on the one hand the close resemblance between the oath and vow, and on the other the understanding of false swearing as an affront to God.

8. *Other Considerations.* The regulations in Lev. 5:1-13 use *šb'* niphal for the element of self-imprecation it expresses. It is clear enough that mention of rash "swearing" (*nišba',* v. 4) refers not to the functional aspect of guaranteeing a statement, but rather only to the unintentional use of an oath formula, something clearly revealing what was already a magical understanding of such oath formulae. That the reference here is to self-imprecation is shown by the association of this case with cursing a perpetrator in the process of determining a perpetrator (v. 1) and with unintentional defilement through contact with unclean things.

Contra M. Noth, vv. 1 and 4 certainly do not refer to witnessing a forbidden curse or rash oath.[43] Lev. 5:1 rather refers to a situation recounted in Jgs. 17:2 (cf. also Prov. 29:24; CD 9:10-12), where a victim pronounces a curse upon the unknown perpetrator. The notion here is apparently that while the witness to such a deed does not fall directly under the curse, that person does come into contact with it in a way analogous to the situation involving contact with something unclean. That the reference is to witnessing the deed emerges not least from the formulation with *rā'â* — one cannot see a curse.

---

42. D. B. Freedman, "An Unnoted Support for a Variant to the MT of Mal 3:5," *JBL* 98 (1979) 405-6.

43. *Leviticus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1965), 43-44.

That v. 4 then refers to the person who "swears" rather than to a witness of the "swearing" can be seen in the formulation with *nepeš kî* parallel to v. 1.

A positive view is taken of those who swear uprightly, those who swear an oath and are fully aware of the gravity of the act designated by *nišba'* and who thus document their own honesty, quite in contrast to those who fear swearing an oath. Hence Eccl. 9:2 views those who swear uprightly together with the righteous *(ṣaddîq),* the clean *(ṭāhôr),* those who sacrifice *(zōḇēaḥ),* and — summarizing — those who are good *(ṭôḇ),* whereas those who "shun an oath" belong to the opposite group. This enumeration also clearly reveals the close relationship between the oath and the cultic-sacral realm.

V. The Niphal with God as the Subject.

1. *With bᵉ.* In 75 occurrences of *šb'* niphal with God as the subject, only 13 indicate by whom God swears. In 5 instances he swears an oath by himself (Gen. 22:16; Ex. 32:13; Isa. 45:23; Jer. 22:5; 49:13), and twice each by his *nepeš* (Jer. 51:14; Am. 6:8) and by his holiness (Ps. 89:36[35]; Am. 4:2). He also swears "by his right hand" *(bîmînô)* in *parallelismus membrorum* with "by his mighty arm" (*bizrôa' 'uzzô,* Isa. 62:8), "by his great name" (*bišmô haggāḏôl,* Jer. 44:26), "by the pride of Jacob" (*big'ôn ya'ᵃqōḇ,* Am. 8:7), and "by his faithfulness" (*be'ᵉmûnāṯeḵā,* Ps. 89:50[49]).

Contra H. W. Wolff, the passages with *nepeš* are not related to the rite encountered in Akkadian texts in which a person grasps his throat when swearing an oath, but rather *nepeš* is to be translated "by oneself."[44] With *šb'* niphal, *bᵉ* indicates the power invoked to guarantee the oath, not that which one risks in swearing the oath. Contra Giesen, the expression *be'ᵉmûnāṯeḵā* does not represent a "basis in the sense of the accompanying circumstances . . . indicating the motivation prompting the swearing of the oath."[45] God's faithfulness establishes not the oath but rather its observance. The context of the passage, namely, the apparent rejection of the Davidic king, uses this formulation to refer to God's faithfulness as guarantor of the oath.

2. *Peculiarities in the Deuteronomistic History.* Over half the occurrences (i.e., 40) are in the Dtr History, and 25 of these refer to God's oath to the fathers in which he promises the land to them (Dt. 1:8,35; 6:10,18,23; 7:13; 8:1; 10:11; 11:9,21; 26:3,15; 28:11; 30:20; 31:7,20,21; 34:4; Josh. 1:6; 5:6; 21:43; Jgs. 2:1. All the passages introduce the oath in an *'ᵃšer* clause in reference either to *'ereṣ* or to *'ᵃḏāmâ* (Dt. 7:13; 11:9,21; 26:15; 28:11; 30:20; 31:20). To these passages one can add Dt. 9:5; 19:8; and Josh. 21:44 with a slightly different formulation.

In Dt. 9:5 the *'ᵃšer* clause refers to the *dāḇār* that God swore to the fathers, though the context makes clear that the reference is actually to the land promise. In 19:8 a *ka'ᵃšer* clause refers to the expansion of Israel's territory, though the continuation *(wᵉnāṯan lᵉḵā 'eṯ-kol-hā'āreṣ 'ᵃšer dibber lāṯēṯ la'ᵃḇōṯeyḵā),* which merely replaces

44. *Joel and Amos,* 281-82.
45. *Wurzel,* 21.

nišbaʿ with *dibber* (cf. Dt. 1:35; Josh. 21:43), shows that the reference is to the land promise. Finally, in Josh. 21:44 the oath refers to the assurance of "rest on every side" from Israel's enemies, a promise to be viewed together with v. 43, which mentions the land promise, and thus also belonging to this group.

These passages are not to be distinguished from the remaining six, which speak of God's oath to the fathers with regard to the covenant (Dt. 4:31; 7:12; 8:18; 29:12), the exodus from Egypt (Dt. 7:8), and the promise of increase (Dt. 13:18). To these one can also add Dt. 28:9 containing Yahweh's oath to the people to make them his own. Commensurate with the character of vv. 7-12a as a late compilation,[46] this verse represents a variation of 29:12. Finally, this group probably includes Dt. 31:23, which mentions an oath to the people but again actually refers to the land promise and as such probably represents an abbreviated formulation.

Hence in the Dtr History, 31 (+2) of 40 occurrences involve an oath God makes to the fathers. One additional group of four passages involves an oath God makes to the exodus generation stipulating that they will not be permitted to enter the land (Dt. 1:34-35; 2:14; 4:21; Josh. 5:6). That this oath is indeed connected with the land promise emerges not only from the observation that the land is, after all, that which was promised to the fathers, but also the observation that two of the four passages stand in direct association with that oath (Dt. 1:34-35; Josh. 5:6).

Only three of the occurrences in the Dtr History, all of which are found outside Deuteronomy, contain an oath made by Yahweh not to the fathers or to the exodus generation, but to the people in general (Jgs. 2:15), the house of Eli (1 S. 3:14), or David (2 S. 3:9), with negative statements predominating (Jgs. 2:15; 1 S. 3:14). None of the passages in this group, however, indicates by whom God swears the oath. Apparently the Dtr History uses *šbʿ* niphal with God as the subject without including the evocation of a guarantor. Correspondingly, the formulation "raise one's hand" or the *ḥay* formula in reference to God occurs within the Dtr History only in Dt. 32:40, with Dt. 32 occupying an acknowledged special status in any event.

The land promise to the fathers occurs in a formulation with *šbʿ* niphal 11 additional times outside the Dtr History; here too it lacks any indication of the guarantor by whom God swears (Gen. 24:7; 26:3; 50:24; Ex. 13:5,11; 33:1; Nu. 11:12; 14:23; 32:11; Jer. 11:5; 32:22). To these passages one can add Nu. 14:16, which mentions an oath to the people promising the land. Analogous to Dt. 31:23, this passage can be viewed as an abbreviated formulation from the perspective of v. 23, one possible reason for the abbreviation being that the reference is to a statement made by a non-Israelite. The two passages outside the Dtr History containing the oath with *šbʿ* niphal that the exodus generation will not enter the land (Nu. 32:10; Ps. 95:11) are accordingly also formulated without *bᵉ*. Here Nu. 32:10, like Dt. 1:34 and Josh. 5:6, stands in the immediate context with the land promise and shows through analogous formulations that the passage was composed from the perspective of the Dtn-Dtr tradition.

---

46. See G. Seitz, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium. BWANT* 93 (1971), 275-76.

This observation is confirmed especially by a comparison with the P text Nu. 14:26ff., which contains the same substantive association but in a completely different form. Hence although the term *šb'* is not used there at all, the procedural aspect of the oath is emphasized by *nāśā'ṯî 'eṯ-yāḏî* (v. 30) and *ḥay-'ānî* (v. 28). Moreover, the text of P articulates the fate of the exodus generation with the words *yippᵉlû pigrêḵem wᵉḵol-pᵉquḏêḵem lᵉḵol-misparḵem* (v. 29), emphasizing that they will not enter the land: *'im-'attem tāḇō'û 'el-hā'āreṣ* (v. 30). By contrast, Nu. 32:11 formulates: *'im-yir'û hā'ᵃnāšîm hā'ōlîm mimmiṣrayim . . . 'ēṯ hā'ᵃḏāmâ,* which cannot be separated from *'im-yir'eh 'îš bā'ᵃnāšîm . . . 'ēṯ hā'āreṣ* (Dt. 1:35) or *lᵉḇiltî har'ōṯām 'eṯ-hā'āreṣ* (Josh. 5:6). Concerning the formulation of the oath in Ps. 95:11 with *'im-yᵉḇō'ûn 'el-mᵉnûḥāṯî,* cf. Dt. 12:9.

In view of the indisputable dependence of Nu. 32:10-11 on the Dtn-Dtr formulation, one can hardly doubt that the Dtn-Dtr formulation was also the source for the comparable formulations in Exodus, Numbers, and Jeremiah that similarly use a niphal of *šb'* with *'ᵃšer* following *'ereṣ* or *'ᵃḏāmâ,* as for Ex. 13:11, which uses *ka'ᵃšer* instead of *'ᵃšer,* and Jer. 11:5 (cf. also Gen. 26:3), in which the *'ᵃšer* clause refers to *šᵉḇu'â,* whose content, however, is the land promise itself. Even the occurrences in Genesis, however, among which only 24:7 is formulated a bit more freely, cannot be viewed as entirely independent of the Dtn-Dtr manner of expression

Hence Gen. 26:3 corresponds almost exactly to Jer. 11:5, the statement regarding God's bequeathing of the land merely being positioned first. Gen. 50:24 can be compared especially with Nu. 32:11 and Dt. 34:4. The freer formulation in Gen. 24:7 does, however, correspond to the current situation in which, along with Abraham, one can, of course, adduce an oath to the fathers. The formulation *nišba' lî,* however, apparently picks up *nišba' lᵉ'aḇrāhām* as seen in — among other passages — Dt. 34:4, while Dt. 1:8 and 11:9 can be compared with *lᵉzar'ᵃḵā 'ettēn 'eṯ-hā'āreṣ.*[47]

Hence the formulation of the land promise to the fathers with *šb'* niphal without any indication of that by which God swears should on the whole be viewed as a Dtn-Dtr formulation. The passages themselves, however, do show that the formula is not one fixed in all its details and that variations are possible. Hence those who accept the oath as an assurance are generally indicated only as *'āḇôṯ* with an appropriate suffix, the first three passages being augmented by the mention of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Dt. 1:8; 6:10; 30:20). The names only (i.e., without *'āḇôṯ*) are found in Gen. 50:24; Ex. 33:1; Nu. 32:11; and Dt. 34:4. Nu. 14:16 and Dt. 31:23 do attract special attention in that here a suffix refers back to the people, the fathers not being specifically named. Sixteen passages replace the statement with *lāṯēṯ lᵉ* (Ex. 13:5; Dt. 1:8,35; 6:10; 7:13; 10:11; 11:9,21; 26:3; 28:11; 30:20; 31:7; Josh. 1:6; 5:6; 21:43; Jer. 32:22; but cf. Jer. 11:5).

3. *Irrevocability.* Discounting for a moment these occurrences in the Dtr History and those influenced by the Dtn-Dtr formulation regarding the land promise as an oath to the fathers, a new picture emerges regarding the use of *šb'* niphal + *bᵉ* with God as the sub-

47. See in this regard Blum, *Komposition,* 370-99.

ject. The 13 occurrences with *bᵉ* are countered by only 8 without *bᵉ*, hence use with *bᵉ* clearly predominates. Passages such as Isa. 45:23 and 62:8 show that these passages do not merely represent pre-Dtn material. The explicit indication of that by which God swears functions to emphasize the special significance of the statement designated by *šbʿ* niphal as a divine oath. Thus the formulation *šbʿ* niphal cannot be viewed as a synonym of, e.g., *dbr* piel. Even the context of passages without *bᵉ* contains clear indications that special significance attaches to the divine words described by *šbʿ* niphal. Hence Ps. 110:4 uses *parallelismus membrorum* to express that God's oath means he "will not change his mind." Ps. 132:11 similarly calls the divine oath a "sure oath from which he will not turn" *(ʾᵉmeṯ lōʾ-yāšûḇ mimmennâ)*. Ps. 89:4(3) associates God's oath with a covenant he thereby makes, and Isa. 14:24 integrates a bicolon into the oath to indicate that God's plans will indeed be realized. Finally, Isa. 54:9 refers back to the Flood to underscore the validity of the oath sworn in the present passage as well.

Some passages without *bᵉ* contain additional emphases on the absolute validity of the divine oath, e.g., Isa. 45:23.

The OT texts' awareness of the irrevocability of a divine oath described by *šbʿ* niphal comes to expression in that they never use *šbʿ* niphal to articulate a punitive oath against the entire people. Such occurs only with regard to individual groups such as the exploitative upper classes (Am. 4:2; 8:7) or arrogant Samaria (6:8). Jer. 22:5 uses *šbʿ* niphal to announce irrevocably the destruction only of the Jerusalem royal palace. Finally, Jer. 44:26 directs such an oath against the Jews in Egypt.

By contrast, Isa. 54:9 addresses the entire people, to whom it announces God's irrevocable assurance of his saving favor. The context of salvific promises to the people ultimately also includes divine oaths with reference to the nations. The salvific promise in 45:14-25 contains the oath that all nations will turn to the God of Israel (v. 23), and 62:8 promises Jerusalem that its enemies will no longer hinder it. From this perspective, the intrusion of the oath formula into the oracles to the nations in Jer. 49:12 and 51:14 is understandable. Isa. 14:24-27 combines the salvific promise to the people with a promise of disaster to Assyria or to the entire earth, emphasizing the unavoidability of the promise not only through *šbʿ* niphal but also through expansion with an entire bicolon.

4. *Oath of Election to David.* An additional divine promise endowed with special gravity through *šbʿ* niphal appears in the oath of election to David in the Psalms. The context of the 3 occurrences in Ps. 89 makes clear that this formulation again refers to an irrevocable divine election. Hence vv. 4 and 36(3,35) stand in the immediate context with the assurance that the election of the Davidic line will last forever and that any revocation would amount to a lie on God's part (cf. v. 36b[35b]).These oaths are then variously equated with a *bᵉrîṯ*, with v. 4(3) using *nišbaʿtî* parallel with *kārattî ḇᵉrîṯ* and v. 36(35) picking up on the statement in v. 35(34) that God will not violate his covenant *(bᵉrîṯî)*, showing that even God's covenant could be understood as an irrevocable self-obligation through an oath.[48] The background to the lament in vv. 39-52(38-51), which

48. See III.3; IV.6.

speaks about the rejection of the king, is that this rejection will not be final, and v. 47(46) can accordingly ask how long this condition will continue. From this perspective, it is then characteristic of the use of *šbʿ* niphal that in this context the psalm points to all the beneficence God has sworn by his faithfulness (v. 50[49]). It is God's honesty (*ʾemûnâ)* that stands in here as the guarantor of the oath and that would have to raise an objection against any final rejection. The significance of the irrevocable appointment of the Davidic royal house also emerges clearly in Ps. 110:4 and 132:11, where *parallelismus membrorum* to the statement with *šbʿ* niphal emphasizes the unalterable nature of this oath.

5. *Punitive Oaths in the Deuteronomistic History.* In the passages in the Dtr History and in those directly dependent on Dtn-Dtr theology that deal with the land promise and with the prohibition to the exodus generation against entering the land, one clearly sees that it is the irrevocability of the statement that is connoted when *šbʿ* niphal is used with God as its subject even when such passages use *šbʿ* niphal without *bᵉ* and without corresponding additions. Hence within this corpus, in addition to the punitive oath to the exodus generation, one finds only two other occurrences of a negative statement guaranteed by *šbʿ* niphal. The summary of the period of the judges in Jgs. 2:11-19* remarks that, "as Yahweh had sworn to them," the apostate Israelites were unable to defend themselves against their enemies (v. 15), though a corresponding oath on God's part is otherwise unattested. Regardless of whether one views the formulation *wᵉḵaʾᵃšer nišbaʿ yhwh* alongside *kaʾᵃšer dibber yhwh* as a subsequent intensification,[49] the statement does in any case function to emphasize the unavoidable consequences of apostasy from God. The ensuing stories illustrate God's tenacity in holding to his oath. For example, 1 S. 3:14 relates how God swears that the sins of the house of Eli will never be forgiven; it alludes back to 2:30, where the distinction between God's simple statement on the one hand and his oath on the other becomes clear. God can retract a statement made with *ʾāmôr ʾāmartî* if the situation has appropriately changed, even if such is not explicitly noted. The oath introduced by *ḥālîlâ lî* in 2:30, however, to which 3:14 refers back with *šbʿ* niphal, is irrevocable, as is also shown by the references to the punitive oath against the exodus generation in Dt. 1:34; 2:14; 4:21; Josh. 5:6; Nu. 32:10, references repeatedly adduced to emphasize the inevitability of death in the wilderness for that generation.

6. *Promises to the Fathers.* It is, however, characteristic of Dtn-Dtr theology that positive oaths clearly predominate, especially as regards the land promise. Moreover, 4 (Dt. 1:34; 4:21; Josh. 5:6; Nu. 31:10) of the 5 direct occurrences of the punitive oath against the exodus generation stand in the immediate context of the land promise. In Deuteronomy alone, 25 occurrences of the land promise are portrayed as an oath God swears to the fathers; to these one can add one more occurrence of this oath to the people in Dt. 31:23 and the promise of increase in 13:18, which in its own turn is insepara-

49. So, e.g., Giesen, *Wurzel,* 342.

ble from the land promise.[50] The intention of this obvious preponderance is to emphasize the irrevocable nature of the land promise and thereby also of the land possession, something also served by what is already an almost formulaic reference to the fathers, a reference that withdraws the promise itself from the sphere of influence of the addressees to the extent it is something already given to them, and that also emphasizes the diachronic validity of the promise from time immemorial, thereby signaling the same for the future. In a situation in which the possession of the land was in very real danger and ultimately was no longer even a reality, that God does not simply promise the land to the fathers (this statement already occurs in 19:8 alongside the oath), but rather swears it to them, means that the promise is still in effect and has only been temporarily suspended. Emphasis on the divine oath in this context recalls its use in Ps. 89:50(49).

Accordingly, whenever authors mention God's assurances to the people, they use *dbr* piel rather than *šb'* niphal except in Dt. 28:9; 31:23, as becomes especially clear if one compares Dt. 19:8 with 12:20, though cf. also 1:21; 6:3; etc.

That within the entire Dtr History only 2 S. 3:9 mentions a positive divine oath referring to the election of David also shows that the Dtn-Dtr authors understood *šb'* niphal, even without the expansion with *b*ᵉ or any other more specific explication, in the sense of an irrevocable and thus extremely unusual divine statement. Because the Dtr History interpreted the catastrophe of the exile theologically, it was not the appropriate place to articulate as a divine oath salvific promises (e.g., in reference to Hezekiah) that the people could refer directly to their own more recent history. One also sees, however, that not even the Dtr History was interested in any unrestricted punitive oaths against the entire people.

Gen. 22:16 and Ex. 32:13 can be related to the previously mentioned passages in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Jeremiah that were directly influenced by the Dtn-Dtr land promise. These two passages, however, do exhibit greater independence in that they refer primarily to the promise of increase and also indicate that God swears by himself.

Gen. 22:15-18 ultimately belongs to the Dtn-Dtr redaction of the patriarchal stories, the closeness to 26:3-5* being undeniable.[51] Ex. 32:13 clearly refers back to this tradition and is thus itself ultimately dependent on Dtn-Dtr influence. That both passages, in contrast to the usual Dtn-Dtr usage of *šb'* niphal, do indeed indicate that God swears "by himself" probably resulted from the discursive force of the model having been weakened through the thematic shift to the promise of increase, which generally appears only peripherally in Deuteronomy, whereupon the otherwise more customary formulation with *b*ᵉ was able to assert itself.

The four passages mentioning God's oath in connection with the covenant represent a more comprehensive adoption of the promises to the fathers. Dt. 29:12 is associated with the making of the covenant in Moab, which is viewed as a fulfillment of the oath

50. See V.2 above.

51. See Blum, *Komposition*, 363-65.

sworn to the fathers. Dt. 8:18 sees in the bountiful supplying of the people the manifestation of the covenant that God swore to the fathers. Dt. 4:31 emphasizes the irrevocability of the covenant, something manifest in God's beneficent favor toward the repentant people; cf. also 7:12.

Even if one agrees with Römer's suggestion that the oath to the fathers actually represents a Dtr theologoumenon that originally referred to the first exodus generation as was only reinterpreted in connection with the fathers during the overall redaction of the Pentateuch itself, the results with regard to the use of *šb'* niphal remain the same: the term emphasizes the reliable and enduring nature of God's covenant or promises.[52]

Mic. 7:20 can be viewed as a counterpart to the assertion that God's covenant with the fathers basically represents God's irrevocable *šᵉḇu'â* and as such can serve as the basis for salvific hope. Along the announcement of forgiveness of sins, this passage expresses the hope that Judah will attain the same faithfulness and loyalty that God swore to the ancestors "from the days of old."

What we find is that the use of *šb'* niphal with God as its subject seeks to express the finality and reliability, even against all appearances to the contrary, of that which God has sworn. The description of the covenant with the fathers as such a divine oath reveals a covenantal theology that also views this covenant as a self-obligation on God's part.

Only Ezk. 16:8 does not quite fit into this framework. The notion of the marriage covenant probably influenced the assertion that God pledges himself to the people and enters into a covenant with them (cf. Prov. 2:17; Mal. 2:14), something commensurate with the fact that although Ezekiel otherwise frequently mentions God's oath both in positive (18:3; 33:11) and negative contexts (5:11; 14:16; 16:48; 17:16; etc.), here he expresses this notion with a formulation of *ḥay 'ānî* rather than with *šb'* niphal. Ezekiel similarly prefers the term *'ālâ* to the derivative *šᵉḇu'â* (cf. 16:59; 17:13,18).

VI. Hiphil.

1. *Factitive Meaning.* Of the 30 occurrences of *šb'* hiphil, 14 merely express the factitive aspect of "prompting someone to *šb'* niphal" in the sense of "putting someone under oath." Hence analogous to the use of *nišba'* as a designation for making a covenant,[53] *hišbîa'* in 2 K. 11:4 in connection with the rebellion organized by Jehoiada means that he made a covenant with the military leaders *(kāraṯ bᵉrîṯ)* and in that regard made them take an oath. That this act takes place before any actual initiation into the coup plans shows the obligatory nature of a covenant sworn in this form; only after the oath can Jehoiada be certain of the men's aid. Accordingly, in Ezra 10:5 Ezra has the Judeans swear an oath of covenant with regard to mixed marriages (cf. also 1 S. 20:17).

Giesen is correct in asserting that in 1 S. 20:17 *bᵉ'ahᵃḇāṯô* does not mean that Jonathan has David swear by his love, even though *šb'* hiphil + *bᵉ* is used in this sense in Gen. 24:3; 1 K. 2:42; 2 Ch. 36:13; Neh. 13:25; Cant. 2:7; 3:5.[54] The attached explana-

52. Römer, 135-271.
53. See IV.3.
54. *Wurzel,* 21.

tion *kî-ʾahᵃḇaṯ napšô ʾᵃhēḇô* makes clear that the same notion provides the background here as in 1 S. 18:1 and 3, where Jonathan makes a covenant with David because he loves him as he does himself *(kᵉnapšô).* Accordingly, *bᵉʾahᵃḇāṯô* in 20:17 is to be understood as a description of circumstances.

Finally, passages with covenantal oaths also include 2 Ch. 36:13, which speaks of the oath Nebuchadnezzar makes Zedekiah swear, a situation based on the notion of a vassal treaty requiring an oath of allegiance. The validity of an oath imposed even by a foreign power becomes clear in that the Chronicler reckons the breaking of this oath, which was indeed sworn by God, among Zedekiah's sins against God. Josh. 2:17 and 20 similarly say that Rahab made the spies swear an oath to her in Jericho not to harm her.

Strikingly, the formulation of an oath with *šbʿ* hiphil for the purpose of guaranteeing the correct execution of a commission clearly predominates over such formulation with *šbʿ* niphal. Hence the statement that Abraham's servant swore the oath (Gen. 24:9) is not made until after the announcement of Abraham's own intention to make him swear it (v. 3), and in v. 37 the servant refers back to Abraham's having made him swear the oath rather than merely to his having sworn it. The same situation emerges when Joseph swears an oath to his dying father. Not only does he point out this situation to Pharaoh (Gen. 50:5) using the formulation *ʾāḇî hišbîʿanî,* but Pharaoh himself emphasizes that Joseph should act "as he made you swear to do" (v. 6). Finally the analogous oath Joseph has the Israelites swear is not expressed by *šbʿ* niphal at all, but rather only by the hiphil (Gen. 50:25; Ex. 13:19).

Ultimately 1 K. 2:42 also belongs to this group. Here Solomon has Shimei swear by God to remain in Jerusalem, though the corresponding passage in vv. 36-38 is not formulated as an oath. What we have here is apparently the Dtr interpretation of the difficult *šᵉḇûʿaṯ yhwh* in v. 43, which originally referred to the divine authority of the king's word.[55]

2. *"Place Someone under a Curse."* The use of *šbʿ* hiphil to mean "place someone under a (qualified) curse" becomes clear especially in 1 S. 14:24-30,36-45 and Josh. 6:26. Josh. 6:26 recounts the curse Joshua speaks against anyone who would try to rebuild Jericho, using the imprecatory formula *ʾārûr hāʾîš.* Although the text says nothing about this curse being accepted by anyone as a self-imprecation or oath, it is nonetheless introduced by the words *wayyašbaʿ yᵉhôšuaʿ,* with even the object of *wayyašbaʿ* missing. The adoption of the passage in 1 K. 16:34 shows that the reference here is not to an oath, since the death of Hiel of Bethel, who rebuilt Jericho, is viewed as a fulfillment of the divine oracle spoken by Joshua. Similar curses against the rebuilding of a destroyed city are also well attested in the OT milieu.[56]

In 1 S. 14:24-30 and 36-45, Saul places the people under a qualified oath in a situa-

---

55. See VII.4 below.

56. Cf., e.g., S. Gevirtz, "Jericho and Shechem: A Religio-Literary Aspect of City Destruction," *VT* 13 (1963) 52-62.

tion of military distress (v. 24): "Cursed be anyone (*'ārûr hā'îš*) who eats food before it is evening," a statement also concretely described as a curse (*'lh* hiphil). That Jonathan knows nothing of this curse and thus goes ahead and eats (v. 27) is of particular significance for the course of the narrative. This feature alone prevents us from speaking about an oath, since an oath requires the presence of the person actually making the oath. Nonetheless, vv. 27-28 twice refer to this curse with *šb'* hiphil (v. 28 even in a *figura etymologica* repeating the curse formula).

The meaning of *hišbîa'* as a qualified curse engaged to prevent a certain action from taking place also occurs in Neh. 5:12 and 13:25. In 5:12 the Judeans promise to end their exploitative actions, a promise Nehemiah makes irrevocable in the presence of priests and with a curse accompanied by a symbolic act (v. 13). Although the text relates how the people accept the curse with a responsive "amen," the tone of the narrative clearly resides on Nehemiah's imprecatory act as introduced by *wā'ašbî'ēm*. Even more unequivocal in this sense is 13:25, where in connection with mixed marriages and in contrast to Ezra 10, Nehemiah, rather than making the Judeans swear a covenantal oath, engages in what is in part a violent confrontation with them, making them "take an oath in the name of God" to cease entering mixed marriages, apparently placing them under a qualified curse in order to secure their allegiance.

3. *Implore, Adjure.* The sense of coercion resonating in Neh. 13:25 that is associated with adjuring someone to do or not to do something by invoking an imprecatory power also appears in Canticles, where the beloved adjures the daughters of Jerusalem not to "stir or awaken" love (2:7; 3:5; 8:4) and to deliver a message to her beloved (5:8-9). That she does not make her friends take an oath is seen in the formulation of the adjuration in 8:4 with *mâ* instead of with *'im* as in 2:7; 3:5. That these adjurations are hardly intended in their entire magical-religious breadth in the context of this love song can be seen in that the friends are adjured not by any deity but rather "by the gazelles or the wild does" (2:7; 3:5). Several scholars have pointed out that *biṣḇā'ôt 'ô ḇᵉ'aylôṯ haśśāḏeh* recalls *(yhwh) ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* and *'ēl šadday*.[57] In this context Mish. *Šeb.* 4:13 shows that adjurations by *šadday* and *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* were customary at least during the later period, suggesting that the adjuration did originate within magical-religious contexts in which deities were normally invoked (cf. Neh. 13:25).

4. *Assertory Use.* Like *šb'* niphal, the hiphil is poorly attested in connection with assertory oaths. The only passage is 1 K. 18:10, according to which Ahab makes the neighboring states swear that they have not found Elijah. By contrast, in 1 K. 22:16 (= 2 Chr. 18:15; cf. 1 S. 3:17-18), as in Neh. 13:25 and the passages from Canticles, the hiphil is used to mean "adjure" even if the context is the guaranteeing of a statement. The meaning of such an adjuration becomes clear in that after the adjuration Micaiah immediately tells Ahab the truth, whereas he initially delivered a false prophecy. The context of this passage also makes clear the difference between the simple use of the

57. E.g., Giesen, *Wurzel,* 19, 81.

oath formula with *ḥay/ḥê* and the explicit reference to the imprecatory power by means of *šbʿ*.[58] The false announcement of good fortune follows directly upon the statement (v. 14): "*ḥay yhwh!* Whatever Yahweh says to me, that I will speak." Only after being pressured by Ahab's imprecatory curse does Micaiah then tell the truth.

5. *Curses in Determining the Truth.* Nu. 5:11-31 attests an independent use of *hišbîaʿ* in connection with a determination of the truth. This text, which has twice been editorially expanded, is based on a description of an imprecatory procedure to which a woman suspected of adultery is subjected, the adultery being proven if the curse actually comes to pass. The woman is made to drink water into which the written curse has been washed off that was previously spoken over her. The curses are introduced by *wᵉhišbîaʿ . . . ʾeṯ-hāʾiššâ bišḇuʿaṯ hāʾālâ* (v. 21). The only action the woman herself undertakes is to accept the curses with the response "amen, amen" (cf. Dt. 27:15-26; Neh. 5:13). The word *hišbîaʿ* retains the meaning "place someone under a (qualified) curse" in v. 19a as well, where the statement releasing the innocent woman has been secondarily tied more closely to the following curse with the prepositioning of *wᵉhišbîaʿ ʾōṯâ hakkōhēn.*

My analysis of the text here deviates from the subdivisions D. Kellermann suggests in that I view v. 19aαb without the first three words as part of the basic stratum.[59] Without this piece, the procedure becomes an unqualified imprecation that would also affect the innocent woman. The first redactional stratum displaced the action to the sanctuary and in the process possibly first introduced the priest as one of the actants. This Priestly redaction was responsible for, among other things, recasting the water of execration into holy water[60] and introducing God as the party enacting the curse, thereby making the woman a *šᵉḇuʿâ* among her people (v. 21aβb), and for inserting the term *hišbîaʿ* in v. 19aα. Contrary to common opinion,[61] at least the basic stratum of Nu. 5:11-31 probably did not represent an ordeal procedure, since it makes no mention of any divine intervention or judgment. One should also differentiate this text[62] from imprecatory threats involving dropsy or "deadly water" as frequently attested during the Kassite period,[63] in §60 of Esarhaddon's vassal treaties with Medean princes,[64] and in Neo-Babylonian self-imprecations,[65] passages concerned with punishment for breaking an oath, whereas the procedures in Numbers describes a curse involving not perjury but an adulterous woman. In Nu. 5 the water functions merely as a medium through which the

58. See IV.1 above.
59. *Die Priesterschrift von Num 1,1 bis 10,10. BZAW* 120 (1970), 70-83.
60. On the older tradition of water and dust, see *ARM,* X, 9, r.13-14.
61. Cf. alongside Kellermann, e.g., H. J. Boecker, *Law and the Administration of Justice in the OT and Ancient East* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1980), 35-36; Giesen, *Wurzel,* 124-31.
62. Contra Giesen, *Wurzel,* 128-29.
63. See, e.g., the documentation in *CAD,* I, 144.
64. See Parpola and Watanabe, *Neo-Assyrian Treaties,* no. 51; *ANET,* 539.
65. *Ur Excavations, Texts,* IV, 171, 16; cf. W. von Soden, review of H. H. Figulla, *Excavations Texts IV* (British Museum/University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, 1949), *JAOS* 71 (1951) 267ff.

curse enters the woman; the washing off of the curse has parallels in the magical bowls of Mesopotamia in which magical formulae were written with ink. Nor is this text related to the water or river ordeals widely attested in Akkadian law in which the suspect is plunged into water and released by the river (god) only if innocent.[66] Finally, one should also reject any paralleling of this text with oaths involving the drinking of freshly drawn water, which probably derives from the notion (also attested in the Indo-European sphere) of water as a guarantor of an oath.[67] The procedure in Nu. 5:11-31 acquires the character of a divine judgment only in its Priestly expansion, whereby the imprecatory water loses its real meaning.

VII. *šᵉḇu'â.*

1. *Content of an Oath.* Of the 30 occurrences of the *qaṭûl* derivative *šᵉḇu'â,* 12 refer to the contents of an oath. Nu. 30:3,11; Josh. 9:20; and 2 Ch. 15:15 all refer to a person's oath, with *šᵉḇu'â* referring to oaths designated by *šb'* niphal/hiphil. In 2 S. 21:7 the formulation *šᵉḇu'aṯ yhwh* refers back to the oath in 1 S. 20:13-17. In Ex. 22:10(11) this expression refers to an assertory oath associated with a determination of the truth.

In Neh. 6:18 the expression *ba'ᵃlê šᵉḇu'â* is used without any contextual reference as a designation for Tobiah's allies (cf. also Neo-Bab. *bēl adê[u mamīt]*[68]). The parallel to *ba'ᵃlê ḇᵉrîṯ* in Gen. 14:13 shows this passage to be a further occurrence of *šb'* in connection with the making of a covenant.[69] Ps. 105:9 (1 Ch. 16:16) also makes this connection between covenant and oath clear in that God's *šᵉḇu'â* refers to the covenant with Abraham, of which God is ever mindful (v. 8). Finally, one might also mention Neh. 10:30, where *bô' bᵉ'ālâ ûḇišḇû'â,* analogous to *bô' babbᵉrîṯ* in Jer. 34:10 and 2 Ch. 15:12, refers to entering a covenantal relationship.

Gen. 26:3; Jer. 11:5 (land promise); and Dt. 7:8 all refer to the promise to the fathers as an oath, with Dt. 7:8 referring to the exodus from Egypt as a fulfillment of the oath to the fathers. Dt. 7:8 differs from the other passages in Deuteronomy in that it is the only passage referring to a *šᵉḇu'â* that God swears to the fathers, and in that otherwise the exodus from Egypt is never included among the promises to the fathers sworn by oath.[70] Because this passage is formulated in the plural while the context in Deuteronomy is formulated in the singular, the frequent suggestion that v. 8a represents a late addendum is probably correct.[71]

The assertion that the oath is "fulfilled" (*qwm* hiphil) or "kept" *(šmr)* also demonstrates the qualification of *šᵉḇu'â* as a reference to content in Gen. 26:3; Jer. 11:5; Dt. 7:8.

---

66. Cf. esp. CH §2; *ANET,* 166; J. Klima, "Das Wasserordal in Elam," *ArOr* 39 (1971) 401-24 (with bibliog.).

67. E. Ebeling, *Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier* (Berlin, 1931), no. 98, 3-4; adduced by M. Fishbane, "Accusations of Adultery," *HUCA* 45 (1974) 39; cf. also Oettinger, 71-73.

68. *AHw,* I, 119.

69. See IV.3 above.

70. See V.6 above.

71. E.g., L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT. WMANT* 36 (1969), 58.

2. *Oath.* Four passages refer simply to an oath as such without providing any more specific information about its content. Eccl. 9:2 uses *šᵉḇuʿâ* simply in *parallelismus membrorum* with *hannišbāʿ*, and Zech. 8:17 refers to perjury as *šᵉḇuʿaṯ šeqer.* Lev. 5:4 and Nu. 30:11 refer to an act associated with an oath as *bišḇuʿâ.*

3. *Curse.* By contrast, 10 passages evoke the notion of curse, as becomes especially clear in 1 S. 14:26, which uses *haššᵉḇuʿâ* to refer to Saul's curse on the people (v. 24),[72] and in Nu. 5:21aα, which refers to the curse under which the woman suspected of adultery is placed[73] as *šᵉḇuʿaṯ hāʾālâ.* The hendiadys *hāʾālâ wᵉhaššᵉḇuʿâ* in Dnl. 9:11 refers to the curses that according to Deuteronomy accompanied the covenant at Horeb (Dt. 28:15-68; 30:17-19). Finally, Jgs. 21:5 cites a great *šᵉḇuʿâ* with *môṯ yûmāṯ.*

This context also includes Nu. 5:21aβ and Isa. 65:15, which mention how a person's fate can become an imprecatory example for others. A comparison between Isa. 65:15, "you shall leave your name to my chosen as a *šᵉḇuʿâ,*" and Jer. 29:22 is revealing, since the passage in Jeremiah makes a similar statement with *qᵉlālâ.* Nu. 5:21aβ uses *šᵉḇuʿâ* together with *ʾālâ,* though v. 27 then refers back to this verse using only the latter term.

The much-discussed passage Hab. 3:9 can also be explained from the perspective of the meaning "curse." In this portrayal of how God gets ready for battle, F. Horst is correct in assuming the presence in v. 9b of a haplography of *t* and reading *šᵉḇuʿôṯ maṭṭôṯ tōʾmar,* yielding a parallel statement to the unsheathing of the bow in v. 9a, namely, that God casts a spell of curses upon the arrows.[74] The background to this passage probably involves a magical ritual. Analogous combinations in Akk. *māmīt qašti/tilpāni,* "curse of the bow," show that weapons could be understood as the bearers of curses.[75]

Passages speaking about release from a *šᵉḇuʿâ* probably also refer to the imprecatory power evoked by oaths. Such passages generally use the root → נקה *nqh,* which refers less to freedom from an obligation than to purity from sin or punishment. Nu. 5:19 thus uses *nqh* to refer to the release of the innocent woman from the consequences of the water of curse. Such becomes especially apparent in Gen. 24:8, where the servant is called *nqh* from the *šᵉḇuʿâ* under the given conditions, something echoed by v. 41 with the words *tinnāqeh/nāqî mēʾālāṯî,* "you will be free from my oath." Accordingly, in Josh. 2:17 and 20 the release of the spies from the *šᵉḇuʿâ* they swore to Rahab is also to be understood primarily as a release from the imprecatory power associated with the curse.

4. *šᵉḇuʿaṯ yhwh/ʾᵉlōhîm.* The expression *šᵉḇuʿaṯ yhwh/ʾᵉlōhîm* appears in two passages with a unique meaning. Eccl. 8:2 emphasizes that the king's command is to be kept because of the *šᵉḇûʿaṯ ʾᵉlōhîm.* The displacement of v. 2b into v. 3 is a disputed

---

72. See V.2 above.

73. See V.5 above.

74. *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. HAT* I/14 (²1954), 182.

75. E.g., *Šurpu,* III, 27, 29; *VAT,* 10760, 10; R. Borger, "Zu den Asarhaddon-Verträgen aus Nimrud," *ZA* 54 (1961) 186.

emendation. Although many interpreters follow the LXX in associating *'al-tibbāhēl* in v. 3a with v. 2b (e.g., *BHS*), doing so clearly makes the half-verse too long, with the remainder of v. 3a then making the rather peculiar statement that one should flee the king. Hence v. 2b is to be understood as the justification for v. 2a.

This expression does not, however, refer simply to the oath of allegiance sworn before God.[76] D. Michel correctly points out that this piece of traditional proverbial wisdom contains close parallels to wisdom outside Israel.[77] According to Aramaic Ahiqar, for example, the king is the emissary of El.[78] Moreover, according to W. G. Lambert, the king's word (lit. "the word of the palace," É.GAL *qí-bi-is-sa*) can be compared to the word of Anu or of the sun god.[79] That being the case, and given the OT understanding of the king as God's representative,[80] *šᵉḇûʿaṯ ʾᵉlōhîm* is to be viewed as the punitive power guaranteed by God that will seek out any who oppose the king. This understanding also works in 1 K. 2:43, where Solomon accuses Shimei of having disregarded his commandment *(miṣwâ)* and accordingly also the *šᵉḇuʿaṯ yhwh,* though vv. 36-37 do not portray the order as an oath. By disregarding the king's commandment, however, Shimei has also disregarded the king's admonition, which in its own turn amounts to a threat of divine punishment.

By inserting the remark in v. 42 that Solomon made Shimei swear by Yahweh, however, the Dtr redactor abandoned this characteristic of the king's word in which, as it were, Yahweh himself is speaking. This remark, however, has no support in the text except precisely the expression *šᵉḇuʿaṯ yhwh* in v. 43. Hence only *hišbaʿtîḵā bᵉyhwh* in v. 42 is to be viewed as Dtr material.[81]

VIII. Qumran. The seriousness of oaths designated by *šbʿ* is still discernible in Qumran, specifically in the Damascus Document,[82] as also reflected Josephus's remark that the Essenes avoided swearing.[83] Moreover, the root is attested only weakly in general in comparison with CD (of 29 reliable occurrences, only 12 are found outside CD), and even then only in connection with entry into the community to the extent the passages are not simply citing biblical formulations (as in CD 19:28) or Jub. 35:8-10 (1Q18 2:2).[84] Here the root is associated with a covenant through which the new member commits himself by oath to the Torah (1QS 5:8; cf. 1QH 14:17). Although CD

---

76. Contra A. Lauha, *Kohelet. BK* XIX (1978), 148.

77. *Untersuchungen zur Eigenart des Buches Qohelet. BZAW* 183 (1989), 93-96.

78. Ahiqar 107; on the reading cf. I. Kottsieper, *Die Sprache der Ahiqarsprücher. BZAW* 194 (1990), 144-45, §227n.

79. *BWL,* 233, 1-5.

80. Cf. B. Lang, "Der vergöttlichte König im polytheistischen Israel," in D. Zeller, ed., *Menschwerdung Gottes — Vergöttlichung des Menschen. NTOA* 7 (1988), 37-59.

81. Contra E. Würthwein, *Das erste Buch der Könige 1–16. ATD* 11/1 (²1985), 8, 25.

82. Cf. E. Qimron, "שבועת הבנים in the Damascus Covenant 15.1-2," *JQR* 81 (1990) 115-18; L. H. Schiffman, "The Laws of Vows and Oaths (Num. 30,3-16) in the Zadokite Fragments and the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 15 (1991/92) 199-214.

83. *B.J.* 2.135.

84. See also Josephus, *B.J.* 2.139.

15:5-9 reflects a similar notion, *šbʿ* appears in this writing in isolated contexts where its meaning is not always clear (e.g., 9:8-12 par. 5Q12 1:3; 15:1-3, though some scholars understand *šbwʿt hbnym* in 15:1-2 as an explicit reference to the oath mentioned in ll. 5-6 regarding entry into the community and thus view both texts as related;[85] cf. also 4Q378 11, 3 with an allusion to the land-promise oath; 504 6, 18; 11QPsAp[a] A, 2; 2, 4 [Yahweh oath]; 3, 1). CD 16:7-12 and 11QT 53:11–54:7 address the validity of oaths, drawing from Dt. 23:22-24 and the perspective in Nu. 30:2-17, though one should note the differences in the way CD and 11QT deal with the same topic (see in this regard Schiffman). For example, the only criterion CD enumerates for determining whether a *šᵉḇuʿâ* must be kept is whether fulfilling it would result in a transgression against the law (cf. also Mish. *Šeb.* 3:6).

IX. LXX. The LXX rendering of *šbʿ* is largely consistent. In most passages the LXX renders the niphal as *omnýein,* which also is used for the hiphil in isolated passages (1 S. 20:17; Ezra 10:5). LXX (B) uses *homologeín* in Ezk. 16:8, whereas *exomologeín* appears in Isa. 45:23. Zech. 5:3 calls the perjurer *epíorkos.* The only genuine deviations are 1 S. 20:3, where the surprising *wayyiššāḇaʿ* is rendered with *kaí apekríthē,* and Josh. 5:6, which uses *diorízein* in interpreting the oath to the exodus generation that they will not enter the land.

The hiphil is consistently translated with forms of *orkízein* and occasionally with *exorkízein* (Gen. 24:3; 1 K. 22:16 B) or *enorkízein* (Neh. 13:25). Neh. 13:25 can be compared to the translations of *šᵉḇuʿâ* as *enórkios* in Nu. 5:21 and *énorkos* in Neh. 6:18. Otherwise the noun is consistently rendered as *hórkos.*

Kottsieper

---

85. Qimron, 116-17.

שֶׁבַע *šeḇaʿ;* שָׁבוּעוֹת *šāḇûʿôṯ*

Contents: I. The Number *šeḇaʿ:* 1. *š/sbʿ* in the Semitic Languages; 2. Meaning and Function: a. Mesopotamia; b. Ugarit; c. Israel. II. The Feast of Weeks: 1. Pre-Deuteronomic Regulations in Ex. 34:22a; (23:16a); 2. Deuteronomic Regulations in Dt. 16:9-10; 3. Regulations in Ezk. 45:18-25; 4. Regulations in the Holiness Code, Lev. 23:15-21; 5. Sacrificial Regulations in Nu. 28:26-30; 6. The Feast of Weeks in Late Israelite and Early Jewish Traditions: a. The Date; b. Association with the Revelation of the Law.

On I: L. Alonso-Schökel, "Strutture numeriche nell'AT," *Strumenti Critici* 10 (1969) 331-42; F. von Andrian, "Die Siebenzahl im Geistesleben der Völker," *Mittheilungen der Anthropolo-*

---

gischen Gesellschaft in Wien 31 (1901) 225-74; A. Archi, "An Administrative Practice and the 'Sabbatical Year' at Ebla," *Studi Eblaiti* 1 (1979) 91-95; K. Balkan, "The Old Assyrian Week," *FS B. Landsberger. AS* 16 (1965), 159-74; M. L. Barré, "The Seven Epithets of Zion in Ps 48,2-3," *Bibl* 69 (1988) 557-63; H. Bauer, "Noch einmal die semitischen Zahlwörter," *ZDMG* 66 (1912) 267-70; J. B. Bauer, "Die literarische Form des Heptaemeron," *BZ* 1 (1957) 273-77; A. Bea, "Der Zahlenspruch im Hebräischen und Ugaritischen," *Bibl* 21 (1940) 196-98; E. Bertheau, *Die sieben Gruppen mosaischer Gesetze in den drei mittleren Büchern des Pentateuchs* (Göttingen, 1840); J. Bottéro, *Mythes et rites de Babylone. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études* IV/328 (Paris, 1985); G. Braulik, "Die Funktion von Siebenergruppierungen im Endtext des Deuteronomiums," *Ein Gott, eine Offenbarung. FS N. Füglister* (Würzburg, 1991), 37-50; V. Brugnatelli, *Questioni di morfologia e sintassi dei numerali cardinali semitici. Publicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Milano* 93 (Florence, 1982); idem, "Some Remarks on Semitic Numerals and the Ebla Texts," in P. Fronzaroli, ed., *Studies on the Language of Ebla. QuadSem* 13 (1984), 85-99; idem, "Sprachwissenschaftliche Überlegungen zu einem literarischen Text aus Ebla," in H. Waetzoldt and H. Hauptmann, eds., *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft von Ebla. Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient* 2 (1988), 173-78; E. Burrows, "The Number Seventy in Semitic," *Or* 5 (1936) 389-92; U. Cassuto, "Biblical and Canaanite Literature," *Tarbiz* 13 (1942) 197-212; 14 (1943) 1-10 (Hebrew) = idem, *Biblical and Oriental Studies,* II (Eng. trans., Jerusalem, 1975), 16-59, esp. 26-29; idem, "The Seven Wives of King Keret," *BASOR* 119 (1950) 18-20 = idem, *Biblical and Oriental Studies,* II, 206-8; K. J. Cathcart, "Micah 5:4-5 and Semitic Incantations," *Bibl* 59 (1978) 38-48; A. Chaim, "The Number Seven," *Dor le Dor* 15 (1986/87) 25-30; A. Y. Collins, "Numerical Symbolism in Jewish and Early Christian Apocalyptic Literature," *ANRW,* II/21.2 (1984), 1221-87; R. Dangers, "Die Zahlen in der Geistesgeschichte der Menschheit," *Universitas* 18 (1963) 301-10; J. Day, "Echoes of Baal's Seven Thunders and Lightnings in Psalm XXIX and Habakkuk III 9 and the Identity of the Seraphim in Isaiah VI," *VT* 29 (1979) 143-51; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Die sieben Kunstwerke des Schmiedegottes in KTU 1.4 I 23-43," *UF* 10 (1978) 57-63; E. Dinkler–von Schubert, "Sieben," *Lexikon der christlichen Ikonographie* (repr. Rome, 1994), IV, 154-56; A. Dreizehnter, *Die rhetorische Zahl. Quellenkritische Untersuchungen anhand der Zahlen 70 und 700. Zetemata* 73 (Munich, 1978); G. R. Driver, "Gender in Hebrew Numbers," *JJS* 1 (1948) 90-104; L. Dürr, *Die Wertung des Lebens im AT und im antiken Orient* (Münster, 1926); D. O. Edzard, "Zu den Zahlen 'sieben' und 'acht,'" *ZA* 75 (1985) 127-28; W. Eltester, "Der siebenarmige Leuchter und der Titusbogen," *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. FS. J. Jeremias. BZNW* 26 (1960), 62-76; F. C. Endres and A. Schimmel, *Das Mysterium der Zahl. Zahlensymbolik im Kulturvergleich* (Cologne, 1984), esp. 142-71; M. H. Farbridge, *Studies in Biblical and Semitic Symbolism* (1923; repr. New York, 1970), esp. 119-39; F. C. Fensham, "The Numeral Seventy in the OT and the Family of Jerubbaal, Ahab, Panammuwa and Athirat," *PEQ* 109 (1977) 113-15; O. Fischer, *Der Ursprung des Judentums im Lichte alttestamentlicher Zahlensymbolik* (Leipzig, 1917); idem, *Orientalische und griechische Zahlensymbolik* (Leipzig, 1918); D. N. Freedman, "Counting Formulae in the Akkadian Epics," *JANES* 3 (1970/71) 64-81; H. Gese, "Die dreieinhalb Jahre des Danielbuches," *Ernten, was man sät. FS K. Koch* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1991), 399-421; U. Glessmer, "Der 364-Tage-Kalender und die Sabbatstruktur seiner Schaltungen in ihrer Bedeutung für den Kult," *FS K. Koch,* 379-98; A. Goetze, "Number Idioms in Old Babylonian," *JNES* 5 (1946) 185-202; A. M. Goldberg, "Der siebenarmige Leuchter. Zur Entstehung eines jüdischen Bekenntnissymbols," *ZDMG* 117 (1967) 232-46; R. Gordis, "The Heptad as an Element of Biblical and Rabbinic Style," *JBL* 62 (1943) 17-26; C. H. Gordon, "Sabbatical Cycle or Seasonal Pattern?" *Or* 22 (1953) 79-81; idem, "The Seventh Day," *UF* 11 (1970) 299-301; idem, "New Data on Ugaritic Numerals," *Studia semitica, philologica necnon philosophica. FS J. Bakoš* (Bratislava, 1965), 127-30; J. H. Graf, *Die Zahl "Sieben"* (Bern, 1917); T. J. Guillén, "Nuevas aportaciones al estudio del sábado," *EstBíb* 26 (1967) 77-89; H. Haag, "Sieben/Siebzig," *BL,* 1511-12; idem, "Zahlensymbolik," *BL,* 1736;

M. Haran, "The Graded Numerical Sequence and the Phenomenon of 'Automatism' in Biblical Poetry," *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971. SVT* 22 (1972), 238-67; W. Hartner, "Zahlen und Zahlensysteme bei Primitiv- und Hochkulturvölkern," *Paideuma* 2 (1941-43) 268-326; J. Hasenfuss, "Zahlensymbolik," *LThK*², X, 1303-5; J. Hehn, *Siebenzahl und Sabbat bei den Babyloniern und im AT. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Studie. LSSt* II/5 (1907); idem, "Zur Bedeutung der Siebenzahl," *Vom AT. FS K. Marti. BZAW* 41 (1925), 128-36; F. Heiler, *Erscheinungsformen und Wesen der Religion. RM* 1 (1961), esp. 167-69; A. Heller, *Biblische Zahlensymbolik* (Reutlingen-Betzingen, 1936); S. Herner, *Die Syntax der Zahlenwörter im AT* (Lund, 1893); W. L. Holladay, "A Proposal for Reflections in the Book of Jeremiah of the Seven-Year Recitation of the Law in Deuteronomy (Deut 31,10-13)," in N. Lohfink, ed., *Das Deuteronomium. BETL* 68 (1985), 326-28; G. Ifrah, *Universalgeschichte der Zahlen* (Frankfurt am Main, 1986); A. Jeremias, *The OT in the Light of the Ancient East* (2 vols.; Eng. trans., New York, 1911), index s.v. "Numbers"; A. S. Kapelrud, "The Number Seven in Ugaritic Texts," *VT* 18 (1968) 494-99; E. Kautzsch, "Zahlen," *RE*, XXI, 598-607; J. Klein, "Notes to Atram-Ḫasīs, Tablet II: The Episode of the Famine According to the Assyrian Version," *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 3 (1990) 76-77; K. Koch, "Sabbatstruktur der Geschichte. Die sogennante Zehn-Wochen-Apokalypse (I Hen 93,1-10; 91,11-17) und das Ringen um die alttestamentlichen Chronologien im späten Israelitentum," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 403-30; B. Landsberger, *Der kultische Kalender der Babylonier und Assyrer. LSSt* 6/I-II (1915); M. R. Lehmann, "Biblical Oaths," *ZAW* 81 (1969) 74-92; R. Lepsius, *Zwei sprachvergleichende Abhandlungen II. Über den Ursprung und die Verwandtschaft der Zahlwörter in der indogermanischen, semitischen und der koptischen Sprache* (Berlin, 1836); H. and J. Lewy, "The Origin of the Week and the Oldest West Asiatic Calendar," *HUCA* 17 (1942/43) 1-152; J. D. Levenson, "The Paronomasia of Solomon's Seventh Petition," *HAR* 6 (1982) 131-35; idem, "The Temple and the World," *Journal of Religion* 64 (1984) 275-98; J. Limburg, "Sevenfold Structures in the Book of Amos," *JBL* 106 (1987) 217-22; M. Liverani, "Ma nel settimo anno . . . ," *Studi sull'Orienta e la Bibbia. FS P. G. Rinaldi* (Genoa, 1967), 49-53; S. E. Loewenstamm, "The Seven-Day-Unit in Ugaritic Epic Literature," *IEJ* 15 (1965) 121-33 = idem, *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Studies. AOAT* 204 (1980), 192-209; idem, "The Numerals in Ugarit," *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies in Jerusalem 1965* (Jerusalem, 1969), 172-79 = *Comparative Studies*, 310-19; idem, "The Number of Plagues in Psalm 105," *Bibl* 52 (1971) 34-38; idem, "The Phrase 'X (or) X plus one' in Biblical and Oriental Laws," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 543 = *Comparative Studies*, 443-44; S. Lüttich, "Über bedeutungsvolle Zahlen. Eine kulturhistorische Betrachtung," *Jahresbericht des Domgymnasium zu Naumburg a.S.* (1891), 1-47; M. Lurker, *Symbol, Mythos und Legende in der Kunst* (Baden-Baden, ²1974); A. Malamat, "Longevity: Biblical Concepts and Some Ancient Near Eastern Parallels," in H. Hirsch and H. Hunger, eds., *Vorträge gehalten auf der 28. RAI in Wien 1981. BAfO* 19 (1982), 215-24; F. R. McCurley Jr., "'And After Six Days' (Mark 9:2): A Semitic Literary Device," *JBL* 93 (1974) 67-81; J. A. McLean, "The Seventieth Week of Daniel 9:27 as a Literary Key for Understanding the Structure of the Apocalypse of John" (diss., Michigan, 1990); J. C. de Moor, "The Art of Versification in Ugarit and Israel II: The Formal Structure," *UF* 10 (1978) 187-217, esp. 190-94; N. Negretti, *Il Settimo Giorno. AnBibl* 55 (1973); R. North, "Zechariah's Seven-Spout Lampstand," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 183-206; A. Orr, "The Seventy Years of Babylon," *VT* 6 (1956) 304-6; G. Pettinato, "La pronuncia sumerica dei numeri da 1 a 10 in un testo lessicale de Ebla," *AION* 41 (1981) 141-43; O. Plöger, "Siebzig Jahre," *FS F. Baumgärtel* (Erlangen, 1959), 124-30; M. H. Pope, "Seven, Seventh, Seventy," *IDB*, IV, 294-95; E. Reiner, "The Etiological Myth of the 'Seven Sages,'" *Or* 30 (1961) 1-11; K. H. Rengstorf, "ἑπτά κτλ.," *TDNT*, II, 627-35; M. Riemschneider, *Von 0 bis 1001. Das Geheimnis der numinosen Zahl* (Munich, 1966); G. Robinson, *The Origin and Development of the OT Sabbath: A Comprehensive Exegetical Approach. BBET* 21 (1988); W. H. Roscher, *Die enneadischen und hebdomadischen Fristen und Wochen der ältesten Griechen. ASGW* 21/4 (1903); idem, *Die Sieben- und Neunzahl im Kultus*

---

und Mythos der Griechen. ASGW 24/1 (1904); idem, *Die Hebdomadenlehre der griechischen Philosophen und Ärzte. ASGW* 24/6 (1906); W. M. W. Roth, *Numerical Sayings in the OT. SVT* 13 (1965); idem, "The Numerical Sequence X/X + 1 in the OT," *VT* 12 (1962) 300-311; P. Rüger, "Die gestaffelten Zahlensprüche des AT und aram. Achikar 92," *VT* 31 (1981) 229-34; O. Rühle, "Zahlen," *RGG*[2], V, 2063-68; U. Rüterswörden, "Zahlensymbolik," in K. Koch et al., eds., *RBL*, 556; A. E. Rüthy, "Sieben Augen auf einem Stein," *TZ* 13 (1957) 523-29; J. M. Sasson, "A Genealogical 'Convention' in Biblical Chronography?" *ZAW* 90 (1978) 171-85; G. Sauer, *Die Sprüche Agurs. Untersuchungen zur Herkunft, Verbreitung und Bedeutung einer biblischen Stilform unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Proverbia c. 30. BWANT* 84 (1963), esp. 26-34; J. Scharbert, "Das Alter und die Alten in der Bibel," *Saeculum* 30 (1979) 338-54; A. Schimmel, "Zahlensymbolik I. Religionsgeschichtlich," *RGG*[3], VI, 1861-63; H. Schmoldt, "Sieben/Siebzig," *RBL*, 467; L. Schwienhorst, *Die Eroberung Jerichos. Exegetische Untersuchung zu Josua 6. SBS* 122 (1986), esp. 76-80; J. B. Segal, "Numerals in the OT," *JSS* 10 (1965) 2-20; K. Sethe, *Von Zahlen und Zahlworten bei den alten Ägyptern und was für andere Völker und Sprachen daraus zu lernen ist* (Strassburg, 1916), esp. 20, 33-37; W. von Soden, "Die Zahlen 20–90 im Semitischen und der Status absolutus," *WZKM* 57 (1961) 24-28; idem, "Zu den semitischen und akkadischen Kardinalzahlen und ihrer Konstruktion," *ZA* 73 (1983) 82-91; idem, "Ableitungen von Zahlwörtern im Semitischen," *Language, Literature, and History. FS E. Reiner. AOS* 67 (1987), 403-14; D. Sperber, "The History of the Menorah," *JJS* 16 (1965) 135-59; K. Staehle, "Die Zahlenmystik bei Philon von Alexandreia" (diss., Tübingen, 1931); K. Steckel, "Zahlen/Zahlensymbolik," in T. Schlatter, ed., *Calwer Bibellexikon* (Stuttgart, [5]1989), 1419-21; M. Steinschneider, "Die kanonische Zahl der muhammedanischen Secten und die Symbolik der Zahl 70-73," *ZDMG* 4 (1850) 145-70; A. Strobel, "Sieben/Siebzig," *BHHW*, III, 1785-86; M. Tsevat, "Abzählungen in 1 Samuel 1–4," *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. FS R. Rendtorff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1990), 207-14; H. Vanstiphout, "Aantal, getal en reeks als stijlmiddelen in de Mesopotamische letterkunde," *Akkadica* 36 (1984) 1-17; B. Z. Wacholder, "The Calendar of Sabbatical Cycles During the Second Temple and the Early Rabbinic Period," *HUCA* 44 (1973) 153-96; E. F. Weidner, *Handbuch der babylonischen Astronomie*, I (Leipzig, 1915); M. Weiss, "The Pattern of Numerical Sequence in Amos 1–2," *JBL* 86 (1967) 416-23; R. R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World* (New Haven, 1977); E. Zenger, "Israel und Kirche im gemeinsamen Gottesbund. Beobachtungen zum theologischen Programm des 4. Psalmenbuches," *Israel und Kirche heute. FS E. L. Ehrlich* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1991), 236-54; H. Zimmern, "Die sieben Weisen Babyloniens," *ZA* 35 (1924) 151-54; O. Zöckler, "Siebenzahl, heilige," *RE*, XVIII, 310-17.

On II: N.-E. Andreasen, "Festival and Freedom," *Int* 28 (1974) 281-97; E. Auerbach, "Die Feste im alten Israel," *VT* 8 (1958) 1-18; I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie* (Leipzig, [3]1927), esp. 378-95; O. Borowski, *Agriculture in Iron Age Israel* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1987); J. Bowman, "Is the Samaritan Calendar the Old Zadokite One?" *PEQ* 91 (1959) 23-37; G. Braulik, "Leidensgedächtnisfeier und Freudenfest. 'Volksliturgie' nach dem deuteronomischen Festkalender (Dtn 16,1-17)," *Theologie und Philosophie* 56 (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1981) 335-57 = idem, *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums. SBAB* 2 (Stuttgart, 1988) 95-121; idem, "Die Freude des Festes. Das Kultverständnis des Deuteronomium — die älteste biblische Festtheorie," in W. Ernst et al., eds., *Theologisches Jahrbuch* (1983) 13-54 = idem, *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums* (1988), 161-218; E. Brögelmann, "Pfingsten in Altisrael," *MGKK* 44 (1939) 119-28; R. Cabié, *La Pentecôte. L'évolution de la cinquantaine pascale au cours des cinq premiers siècles* (Tournai, 1965); A. Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz und Deuteronomium. AnBibl* 66 (1976); A. Cooper and B. R. Goldstein, "The Festivals of Israel and Judah and the Literary History of the Pentateuch," *JAOS* 110 (1990) 19-31; G. Dalman, *AuS*, I/2, esp. 461-68; R. Le Déaut, "Pentecôte et tradition juive," *Assemblées du Seigneur* 51 (1963) 22-38; idem, "*Šāvūʿōt* och den kristna pingsten i NT," *SEÅ* 44 (1979) 148-70; M. Delcor, "Pentecôte," *DBS*, VII, 858-79; B.-J. Diebner, "Gottesdienst II. AT," *TRE*, XIV, 5-28; B. D.

I. The Number *šeḇa'*.

1. *š/sb' in the Semitic Languages.* In the Semitic languages the cardinal number "seven" is a nondeverbal primary noun occupying a syntactical position between a substantive and an adjective and formed from the consonantal sequence s_1b' > *šb'* and *sb'*, beginning allophonically with *s.*[1] In Hebrew the cardinal number "seven/sevenness" is *šeḇa'/šiḇ'â.*[2] The cardinal number "seventy" is constructed from the pl. *šiḇ'îm.* The ordinal numbers *šᵉḇî'î/šᵉḇî'îṯ* (also as a fraction[3]) are constructed by adding *-î (nisbe* of *-ay).* The numerical adj. "sevenfold" is constructed from the dual *šiḇ'āṯayim* (Gen. 4:15,24, et passim), the distributive number "seven each" by repeating the cardinal number *šiḇ'â šiḇ'â* (Gen. 7:2).[4] The term *šāḇûa'*, "unit of seven, week," is a denominated abstraction deriving from the cardinal number.[5]

In Aramaic the cardinal number *šb'/šb'h* is attested from Old Aramaic to Imperial Ara-

---

Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. trans., New York, 1966), 1-78; H. Renckens, *De Godsdienst van Israël* (Roermond, ²1962); R. Rendtorff, "Der Kultus im alten Israel," *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 2 (1956) 1-21; K. H. Rengstorf, "Christliches und jüdisches Pfingstfest," *MGKK* 45 (1940) 75-78; H. H. Rowley, *Worship in Ancient Israel* (London, 1967); S. Safrai, *Die Wallfahrt im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels. Forschungen zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog* 3 (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981); G. Sauer, "Israels Feste und ihr Verhältnis zum Jahweglauben," *Studien zum Pentateuch. FS W. Kornfeld* (Vienna, 1977), 135-41; T. Schärf, *Das gottesdienstliche Jahr der Juden. Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Berlin* 30 (1902); D. Sidersky, "Les fêtes agraires des Phéniciens et des Hébreux," *Actes du XXᵉ Congrès Int. des Orientalistes* (Louvain, 1940), 275-78; W. von Soden, "Ableitungen von Zahlwörtern im Semitischen," *Language, Literature, and History. FS E. Reiner. AOS* 67 (1987), 403-14; S. Talmon, "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert," in C. Rabin and Y. Yadin, eds., *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. ScrHier* 4 (1958), 162-99; H. S. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and the Jewish Worship* (London, 1920); F. Thieberger, ed., *Jüdisches Fest, jüdischer Brauch* (Königstein, ³1985); J. H. Tigay, "שָׁבוּעַ," *EMiqr,* VII, 468-79; Y. Vainstein, *The Cycle of the Jewish Year. A Study of the Festivals and of Selections from the Liturgy* (Jerusalem, 1953); P. Volz, *Die biblischen Altertümer* (Calwer, ²1914, repr. 1989), esp. 81-107; T. C. Vriezen, *Religion of Ancient Israel* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1967); L. Wächter, "Das jüdische Festjahr," *Zum Verständnis des Judentums. Vier Vorträge* (Berlin, 1985), 9-26; G. Wallis, "Die Sesshaftwerdung Alt-Israels und das Gottesdienstverständnis des Jahwisten im Lichte der elohistischen Kritik," *ZAW* 83 (1971) 1-15; P. Weimar, "Kult und Fest. Aspekte eines kultverständnisses im Pentateuch," in K. Richter, ed., *Liturgie — ein vergessenes Thema der Theologie? QD* 107 (²1987), 65-83; M. Weinfeld, "Pentecost as Festival of the Giving of the Law," *Immanuel* 8 (1978) 7-18; idem, "The Decalogue: Its Significance, Uniqueness, and Place in Israel's Tradition," in E. B. Firmage et al., eds., *Religion and Law: Biblical-Judaic and Islamic Perspectives* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1990), 3-47; J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (Eng. trans. 1885, repr. Cleveland, 1957), 83-120; F.-E. Wilms, *Das jahwistische Bundesbuch in Exodus 34. SANT* 32 (1973); idem, *Freude vor Gott. Kult und Fest in Israel* (Regensburg, 1981); A. Yaari, תולדות חג שמחת תורה (Jerusalem, 1964); S. J. Zevin, המועדים בהלכה (Tel Aviv, ⁵1956).

1. Von Soden, "Ableitungen," 404; *HAL,* IV, 1399; Brugnatelli, *Questioni,* 121ff.
2. *HAL,* IV, 1400, a multiplicate adverb meaning "seven times."
3. *GK,* §98b.
4. *GK,* §134q.
5. *GK,* §98b.

number *sebî-šu* with the adverbial affix *-i* and a suffix.[25] The orthography of the noun *si-bi-it/si-bit,* "(seven-day) week, seven-group, sevenness," allows for *sibittu (pirist-),*[26] *sebettu (parast-),*[27] or *sebittu* (*parist-;* see Edzard). Assyrian attests construction of the numeral with an initial *š-,* Old Assyrian as *aššabêšu*[28] and *šabî-šu,*[29] and Neo-Assyr. *šabâ.*[30] Under West Semitic influence, the forms *šibitān/šib'tān,* "seven times" (combining the adverbial ending TA.ÁM with West Semitic *-aym),*[31] and *šeb'u*[32] emerge. Even though no syllabic witness has emerged from Ebla, something that would be of special significance for determining where Eblaite fits into this history,[33] one can assume that the words began with *s* since the contexts of witnesses exhibit no association with the lexeme *šb'* ("sate").[34]

The phonemic change *š-* > *s-* in the East Semitic dialects was probably prompted by a dissimilatory interruption of the numerical sequence with *š- (ḫamiš, *šešš, tiše, ešer).*[35] Such dissimilation probably came about alongside assimilation (including, e.g., *sebe* and *samāne* ["eight"][36]) on the basis of the sandhi form in the feminine absolute state after a final *-t (+ š > s).*[37]

Old South Arabic attests *sb'/sb't* ("seven") and *sb'y* ("seventy") as cardinal and ordinal numbers,[38] while Old Ethiopic (Ge'ez) attests *sab' (sab'u), sab'attu (sab'atu)* ("seven"), and *sab'an *sab'ān* ("seventy") as a cardinal and ordinal number. The independent Old Ethiopic forms *sabu'*[39] and *subā'e* refer to the week and to the seven-year cycle. The vb. *sabbĕ'a,* "do something sevenfold," derives from the numeral.[40] In Arabic the cardinal number is *sab', sab'at* ("seven"), *sab'ūn* ("seventy"), and the ordinal number *sābi'.*[41] These forms beginning with the sibilant *s* derive from Proto-Semitic *šb'.*[42] B. Landsberger views the lexemes *šb'/sb'* as "examples of irregular cor-

---

25. Concerning the construction of the distributive number, see von Soden, "Ableitungen," 408-9; concerning the numerical adverb, see *GAG,* §71b.

26. *CAD,* XV, 230-31.

27. *AHw,* III, 1033.

28. D. D. Luckenbill, *The Annals of Sennacherib. OIP* 2 (1924), 39, IV, 54.

29. A. T. Clay, *Letters and Transactions from Cappadocia. Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of James B. Nies, Yale University,* IV (New Haven, 1927), 90, 9.

30. Erra Epic I, 38S; cf. L. Cagni, *L'epopea di Erra. SS* 34 (1969), 62.

31. EA 196:4; 215:6; 221:6.

32. Idrimi inscription 29, 45; cf. Liverani, 51.

33. Cf. J. Krecher, "Sumerische und nichtsumerische Schicht in der Schriftkultur von Ebla," in L. Cagni, *Il Bilinguismo ad Ebla. Istituto Univers. Orient. Dipart. Studi Asiatici* Ser. min. 22 (Naples, 1984), 149-50; Brugnatelli, "Some Remarks," 91.

34. So following Brugnatelli, "Sprachwissenschaftliche Überlegungen," 173-76.

35. Edzard, 127.

36. Cf. R. M. Voigt, *WO* 12 (1981) 166 n. 139.

37. Brugnatelli, "Sprachwissenschaftliche Überlegungen," 173 n. 3.

38. Biella, 326-27.

39. A. Dillmann, *Ethiopic Grammar* (Eng. trans., London, 1907), 365.

40. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 482.

41. A. Murtonen, *Hebrew in Its West Semitic Setting* I/Bb-E (Leiden, 1989), 409, 458.

42. S. Moscati, ed., *An Intro. to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. PLO* 6 (1964), 33-34.

respondence of fundamentally related words."[43] Although scholars have repeatedly proposed an historical relationship with Egyp. *śfḫ* and Copt. *sašf*, such has yet to be proven.[44]

Forms of the ending *-(a)t* understood as feminine and designating the *nomen unitatis*[45] are combined with masculine nouns.[46] Distinguishing the *nomen unitatis* from the feminine nouns is accomplished through the opposition of the masculine numeral. Hebrew is historically conservative in that it developed no denominated verb forms from the numeral *šb'* and no deverbal numeral forms.

2. *Meaning and Function.* a. *Mesopotamia.* In Mesopotamia the number seven was of preeminent significance in enumerations; cf. among other things the enumeration of the seven names of Ishtar,[47] of the seven stars in which the god Enlil manifested himself,[48] of the seven *lumāšū*[49] in the "astral lists"[50] that in Enuma Elish[51] represent the great gods,[52] of the seven names of the illness demon Lamashtu,[53] and of the seven bans in the Shurpu text, which conclude with the seventh ban of the seven members of the patriarchal house.[54] In enumerations the number seven indicates completeness and self-enclosure. One lexical text[55] translates Sum. *IMIN,* "seven," as *kiššatum,* "totality, world"[56] (cf. also the translation of Sum. *7.àm dingir 7.àm meš* as *sebet ilāni kiššati,* "seven gods of the world" in a magical text[57]). As symbolic representations of the universe, the ziggurat in Borsippa, which one dedication document calls the "temple of the seven drivers of heaven and earth,"[58] and the one in Babylon[59] each has seven stories.

---

43. "Akkadisch-Hebräische Wortgleichungen," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 185; for a proposed explanation, see E. A. Knauf, *Midian. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Palästinas und Nordarabiens am Ende des 2. Jahrtausends v.Chr.* (Wiesbaden, 1988), 73-75.

44. Sethe, 20; *KBL*², 944; Murtonen, 458.

45. *GAG,* §60a.

46. Michel, *Syntax,* 31-33; cf. Brugnatelli, "Some Remarks," 95-96; concerning the deviation in Zech. 3:9 and 4:2, see C. L. and E. M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8. AB* 25B (1987), 208-9.

47. G. A. Reisner, *Sumerisch-babylonische Hymnen* (Berlin, 1896), 109, 56 r.69-70.

48. *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts,* 142 III 3-10; cf. Weidner, 59.

49. R. Borger, *AfO* 19 (1959/60) 113.

50. Weidner, 16, 14-18; 19, 7-10.

51. EnEl IV 19ff.; B. Landsberger and J. V. Kinnier Wilson, "The Fifth Tablet of Enuma Elish," *JNES* 20 (1961) 156.

52. H. Spieckermann, *Judah unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit. FRLANT* 129 (1982), 259.

53. *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania,* 12003.

54. Shurpu III, 1ff.; J. Craig, *Assyrian and Babylonian Religious Texts* (Leipzig, 1895-97), II, 3-4; cf. E. Reiner, *Šurpu. A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations. BAfO* 11 (1958), 19.

55. *CT,* 18, 29 II 19 (II 20: 7 = 7 *-et* = *kiši;* on the relationship with the city of Kiš, see D. O. Edzard, *RLA,* V, 610.

56. A. Deimel, *Šumerisches Lexikon* (repr. Rome, 1961), no. 598c.

57. *CT,* 16, 13 III 18.

58. See E. Unger, *RLA,* I, 423.

59. See E. Unger, *RLA,* I, 364-65.

seven infertile years.[73] Theses proposing a seven-year rhythm of *mīšarum* acts during the Old Babylonian period[74] are as unsupported[75] as those proposing a seven-year duration of kingship in Ebla.[76]

Finally, the number seven can enhance various aspects of whatever is being counted and express elements of fullness and power. The underworld has seven gates[77] or twice seven gates[78] to ward off intruders. The attendant notion of seven walls around the underworld[79] includes an element of magical protection.[80] The horrible nature of Ninurta's club is emphasized in the allegation that it has seven heads like a snake,[81] just as the mythical poisonous snake *bašmu(m)* is alleged to have seven tongues.[82] This context includes the two sets of seven birth goddesses.[83] Incantation texts underscore the comprehensive evil nature of demons by enumerating groups of seven,[84] which are often called the "seven sons of Anu."[85] Prayers of lament also parallel such demons with adversaries in sets of seven.[86] The number seven guarantees completeness such that none of the evil powers and actants are omitted. The Erra Epic summarizes the demons as the "seven deity" ᴰ*sebittu,* the power of disaster of the god Erra.[87] Recitation of the Erra myth is recommended as a means of thwarting the negative "seven deity," a

---

73. Gilg. VI, 104-13; cf. Klein, "Notes to Atram-Ḫasīs," 76-77.

74. So J. J. Finkelstein, "Some New *Misharum* Material and Its Implications," *FS B. Landsberger. AS* 16 (1965), 243ff.

75. G. Komoróczy, "Zur Frage der Periodizität der altbabylonischen *mišarum*-Erlässe," *Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East. FS I. M. Diakonoff* (Warminster, 1982), 196-205.

76. So G. Pettinato, *The Archives of Ebla* (Eng. trans., Garden City, N.Y., 1981), 71-72.

77. On the myth of Nergal and Ereshkigal, cf. Gurney and Finkelstein, *Sultantepe Tablets,* I, no. 28, I, 20-26; III, 41-47; VI, 21-28; on the epic narrative structure, cf. K. Hecker, *Untersuchungen zur akkadischen Epik. AOATSup* 8 (1974), 152-53; concerning Ishtar's descent into hell, cf. *CT,* XV, 46, 60; 47 r.45.

78. EA 357:67-74; cf. 46-51.

79. T. Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness* (New Haven, 1976), 228.

80. Cf. *CT,* XVI, 13 46, 47a, 48a; cf. M. Hutter, *Altorientalisch Vorstellungen von der Unterwelt. OBO* 63 (1985), 160; on the seven judges of Anunnaki in the underworld, cf. Jacobsen, 57, 59, 228.

81. *CAD,* XV, 204; cf. O. Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans., New York, 1978), ills. 51, 52.

82. *Texts in the Iraq Museum* (Baghdad), IX, 65-66.

83. Atrahasis, I, 274-98; cf. W. von Soden, "Konflikte und ihre Bewältigung in babylonischen Schöpfungs- und Fluterzählungen," *MDOG* 111 (1979) 23; on the iconography see U. Winter, *Frau und Göttin. Exegetische und ikonographische Studien zum weiblichen Gottesbild im alten Israel und in dessen Umwelt. OBO* 53 (1983), 380 n. 880.

84. *CT,* XVI, 12, 3; 14, 17-18; 15, 60-61; 19, 12-51a; XVII, 13, 13-19; cf. J. Bottéro, *RLA,* VII, 209-10.

85. E. Ebeling, *RLA,* I, 115; II, 108; concerning the two sets of seven daughters of Anu, see Bottéro, *Mythes,* 286.

86. *BWL,* 32, 57-67.

87. Erra Epic I, 29 et passim; cf. L. Cagni, *L'epopea di Erra,* 152-53; cf. also Bottéro, *Mythes,* 267-68, 293; on the derivation of the "seven deity" from Anu, see H. Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion. Assyriologische Bibliothek* 12 (Leipzig, 1901), 98, 3.

deity countered elsewhere by a positive deity of succor and protection.[88] Some enumerations include this "seven deity" as an independent deity[89] responsible for the draft resolutions in the divine council;[90] this deity could be invoked (in Neo-Assyrian royal inscriptions and contractual texts[91]) and was worshiped in temples.[92]

Neither the origin nor the meaning of this deity or of the number seven can be deduced from the number of planets or Pleiades,[93] since the number of planets as seven including Sin and Shamash already presupposes the significance of the number seven. Several factors contribute to the special significance of the number seven among the other numbers. The division of the lunar phases into four parts makes this number appropriate for periodization,[94] lending it thus a preeminent position among many different peoples.[95] Although an etymological explanation of its meaning within the Semitic sphere is probably not possible, an element of early Semitic paretymological assonance was probably at work between the number *šb'* and the common Semitic root *šb'*, "become sated."

b. *Ugarit.* In Ugarit the number seven has hitherto been attested only in cuneiform materials, not in syllabic materials.[96] In enumerations the number seven expresses completeness, as it does, for example, in the enumerations of the seven hypostases of Ba'al in the lists of deities and sacrifices,[97] in the enumeration of the seven Kathirat goddesses of conception and birth, and in hymns.[98] This element of completeness enables the number seventy to refer to a larger community such as that of the seventy sons of Athirat[99] and lends the number "seven" significance also in ceremonial and ritual acts. The epistolary formula "from afar I fall seven times and seven times at the feet of X" intensifies the Akkadian version ("twice seven times").[100] In the ritual of the month of Rishyen, the king prays seven times on the seventh day.[101] According to the

---

88. Shurpu, IV, 66.

89. *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Leipzig), III, 228; *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes* (Paris), II, 14 et passim; concerning the epithets, see K. L. Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta. StOr* (1938), 442.

90. Jacobsen, *Treasures of Darkness,* 86.

91. See R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons, Königs von Assyrien. BAfO* 9 (1956), 109, §69 IV 5; cf. 96 §65 10; *TUAT,* I, 158-59, 171.

92. Cf. F. Safar, *Sumer* 13 (1957) 219ff.; B. Menzel, *Assyrische Tempel* (Rome, 1981), 83, 92, et passim (see index).

93. F. Thureau-Dangin, *Rituels Accadiens* (Paris, 1921), 79, r.33; cf. F. X. Kugler, *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel,* I (Münster, 1907), 11; on the Pleiades: C. Virolleaud, *L'astrologie chaldéenne* (Paris, 1908-12), Adad 17, 34; Sup 59, 10; cf. *CT,* XIX 19, 51-57.

94. See E. Chiera, *Sumerian Religious Texts* (Upland, 1924), 24, 76-79; EnEl V, 12-22.

95. See Roscher, *Hebdomadenlehre.*

96. *WUS,* no. 2580; Whitaker, 583-86; cf. J. Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription. HSM* 32 (1987), 293.

97. *KTU* 1.47, 5-11; 1.118, 4-10; 1.148, 2-3, 10-12.

98. *KTU* 1.24, 47-50; cf. W. Herrmann, *ZÄS* 100 (1974) 104-8; B. Margalit, *The Ugaritic Poem of Aqht. BZAW* 182 (1989), 285-87.

99. *KTU* 1.4, VI, 6; cf. Fensham.

100. See Kaiser, *ZDPV* 86 (1970) 21.

101. *KTU* 1.41, 52-53.

The seven-year schema *lymm lyrḫm lyrḫm lšnt mk bšbʻ šnt,* "from days to months, from months to years, lo, after seven years . . . ," is independent of the seven-day schema.[115]

Finally, as in Akkadian the number seven can enhance elements of whatever is being counted by expressing fullness and power. To underscore the power of negative forces, seven heads are attributed to the mythical serpent Lotan (*ltn bṯn brḥ . . . šlyt d šbʻt rʼšm,* "Lotan, the crooked serpent . . . a tyrant, seven-headed").[116] The goddess Anat has seven maidens, Aqhat seven bridal attendants.[117] Another text speaks of the seven portions *(šbʻ ydty)* of clay serving as food in the underworld in the cup of the god Mot.[118] Keret loses seven wives.[119] Seven times El asks the gods, "Who can remove the sickness, driving out the malady?" without receiving an answer.[120] Concerning the significance of the number seven in literary redaction, see among other things also the sevenfold repetition of the substantiation clauses *(ʻlk)* and the chiastic structuring of the seven elements in the enumeration of divine abodes.[121]

The aspect of fullness is especially underscored by the X/X + 1 combination seven/eight.[122] Baʻal is accompanied by seven young lads and eight boars,[123] a possible reference to the Pleiades, whose disappearance accompanies the drought, or the seven bolts of lightning accompanying Baʻal.[124] Baʻal has "seven bolts of lightning, and eight camps of thunder were the arrows of the lightning."[125] Baʻal's seven-year banishment to the underworld[126] is associated with the X/X + 1 schema seven/eight in the Aqhat Epic as *šbʻ šnt yṣrk bʻl ṯmn rkb ʻrpt,* "seven years shall Baʻal fail, eight the Rider of the

115. *KTU* 1.6, V, 7-9; 1.19, IV, 13-15; cf. 1.6, II, 26-27; *ANET,* 141; see in this regard D. G. Pardee, "The Preposition in Ugaritic," *UF* 8 (1976) 219, 243; a secondary abbreviated version *mk bšbʻ šnt,* "then in the seventh year," in 1.15, III, 22; Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies,* 209; cf. also J. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan. SVT* 5 (^{2}1965), 78.

116. *KTU* 1.5, I, 1, 3; 1.3, III, 42; *ANET,* 137-38; cf. J. Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea* (Cambridge, 1985), 4-5, 24.

117. Anat: *KTU* 1.3, II, 2; cf. Sauer, *Sprüche Agurs,* 28; Aqhat: *KTU* 1.18, I, 25; cf. M. Dijkstra and J. C. de Moor, "Problematic Passages in the Legend of Aqhâtu," *UF* 7 (1975) 194; a different view in Margalit, *Aqht,* 328.

118. *KTU* 1.5, I, 20-21.

119. *KTU* 1.14, I, 20; cf. J. M. Sasson, "The Numeric Progression in Keret I:15-20," *Cananea selecta. FS O. Loretz. SEL* 5 (1988), 181-88.

120. *KTU* 1.16, V, 10-22; *ANET,* 148.

121. *KTU* 1.6, V, 11-19; *ANET,* 141; 1.4, I, 13-19; *ANET,* 131; cf. Negretti, 36-39.

122. R. Yaron, "Middle Assyrian Laws and the Bible," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 553; cf. Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies,* 443-44.

123. *KTU* 1.5, V, 8-9; *ANET,* 139; cf. also *KAI* 27.17; and F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, "Phoenician Incantations on a Plaque of the Seventh Century B.C.," *BASOR* 197 (1970) 44-45.

124. J. C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Baʻlu According to the Version of Ilumilku. AOAT* 16 (1971), 187-88; Day, "Echoes," 148.

125. *KTU* 1.101, 3-4; cf. Day, *God's Conflict,* 59-60.

126. *KTU* 1.6, V, 8-9; *ANET,* 141; on the significance of this motif for the question of an annual cultic recitation of the Anat-Baʻal myth, cf. C. H. Gordon, *UT,* 406; Kapelrud, "Number Seven"; de Moor, *Seasonal Pattern,* 32-34, 245-49; *CML*^{2}, 18; A. Caquot, *DBS,* IX, 1378-80; del Olmo Lete, *Mitos,* 149-50.

Clouds,"[127] and in a mythical fragment as *šby' šnt il ml' wṯmn nq pnt 'd*, "seven years the god [Ba'al] completes eight cycles of time."[128] The palace of the god El has "seven rooms, eight anterooms."[129] In his blessing to Keret, El promises that Keret's future wife "shall bear seven sons unto you; yea, eight she'll produce for you."[130] Accordingly, Keret's royal house, which includes "seven brothers, eight sons of the (same) mother," is destroyed when the sons themselves are lost.[131] The X/X + 1 combination seven/eight cannot be adequately interpreted merely as an indefinite number.[132] The addition of the number eight underscores rather the aspect of completeness already suggested by the number seven. The conflict between Ba'al and Mot is described in a seven-year cycle and in a seven/eight-year schema to underscore the length of the period involved.[133] Other texts attribute seven and eight rooms to the god El, and in one Mot is possibly claiming eight rooms for himself in order to surpass El.[134] The interpretive point of intersection is in each case the number seven with its attendant suggestion of completeness, an element that does not, however, obscure the numerical element.[135]

The expansion of the X/X + 1 schema seven/eight itself then expands the element of completeness into a 70/80 schema and thence into a 77/88 schema. Seventy/eighty vassals from Hurriya are invited to Keret's funeral banquet,[136] the number seventy designating the group as a closed unity[137] and the combination with the number eighty underscoring its size. The potency of Ba'al as well as the grief at his death is described with the 77/88 schema. Ba'al "lies with her [a young cow] seventy-seven times, she allows him to mount eighty-eight times." "His seventy-seven brothers, the eighty-eight" weep for Ba'al, who has been banished to the underworld for seven years.[138] The portrayal of the completeness of the places conquered by Ba'al enhances the X/X + 1 schema even further by expanding it to "sixty-six towns . . . seventy-seven hamlets . . . eighty . . . ninety."[139]

---

127. *KTU* 1.19, I, 42-44; *ANET*, 153; cf. in this regard P. J. van Zijl, *Baal: A Study of Texts in Connexion with Baal in the Ugaritic Epics. AOAT* 10 (1972), 275-76; a different view is taken by W. G. E. Watson, "Puzzling Passages in the Tale of Aqhat," *UF* 8 (1976) 377; J. C. de Moor, "Marduk in Ugarit," *FS O. Loretz*, 68.

128. *KTU* 1.12, II, 44-45; cf. II, 9 concerning Ba'al's identity; cf. also 1.23, 66-67 (see above); N. Wyatt, "Atonement Theology in Ugarit and Israel," *UF* 8 (1976) 418; J. C. de Moor, *An Anthology of Religious Texts from Ugarit. Nisaba* 16 (Leiden, 1987), 133 n. 39.

129. *KTU* 1.3, V, 11-12, 26-27; cf. 1.5, IV, 9; *ANET*, 137.

130. *KTU* 1.15, II, 23-25; *ANET*, 146.

131. *KTU* 1.14, I, 8-9; *ANET*, 143.

132. So Loewenstamm, *Comparative Studies*, 443-44; cf. Haran, "Graded Numerical Sequence," 256.

133. *KTU* 1.6, V, 8-9; *ANET*, 141; 1.19, I, 42-44; *ANET*, 153.

134. 1.3, V, 11-12, 26-27; 1.5, IV, 9; concerning the textual reconstruction of the latter passage, see de Moor, *Anthology*, 76.

135. Contra Kapelrud, "Number Seven."

136. *KTU* 1.15, IV, 6-7; *ANET*, 146.

137. *KTU* 1.4, VI, 46.

138. *KTU* 1.5, V, 19-21; *ANET*, 139; 1.12, II, 48-49.

139. *KTU* 1.4, VII; *ANET*, 134.

This emphasis on the number seven in Ugarit was prompted by several factors. First, one should note the influence of traditions from the East Semitic linguistic sphere discernible in the adoption of the ceremonial formula of greeting in the epistolary formula. The lunar calendar also exerted an influence. The sacrificial list for the month of Rishyen with its positioning of sacrifices for the fifth and seventh day behind those for the new and full moons, however, shows that the full-moon phase was of greater significance for sacrificial service than was the half-moon phase.[140] As the occurrences of *šb'* I, "sate oneself," in one of the tablets of the Aqhat Epic and of *šb'* II, "seven," show, the two lexemes may well have been subject to paretymological influence with regard to their initial sounds.[141]

c. *Israel.* As in Babylonian, Assyrian, and Ugaritic traditions, in the OT the number seven transcends the merely concrete notion of counting to include elements of completeness, energy, and fullness, thus lending special significance to the number *šeḇa'* and its derivations among the numerals in the OT. The enumeration of the seven conquered nations in Dt. 7:1; Josh. 3:10; 24:11[142] as well as the seven-part sacrificial list in Dt. 12:6 (abbreviated in v. 11) evoke the notion of totality. The number seven in the enumeration of the generations in Gen. 4:17-18 evokes the totality of a self-enclosed period of time.[143] This genealogy has been influenced by the Mesopotamian tradition of the seven antediluvian *apkallū,* "wise ones."[144] Samson's power is concretely evoked by the seven locks of his hair (Jgs. 16:13,19). The motif of the locks, possibly of Philistine origin,[145] was combined with the number seven to express fullness and strength. Samson is unsuccessfully bound with seven fresh bowstrings (Jgs. 16:7-8). In times of distress there will be only one man for every four women (Isa. 4:1). When her fate is turned, the barren woman will bear seven children (1 S. 2:5). The loyal daughter-in-law who enters the Levirate marriage is worth more than seven sons (Ruth 4:15). Wicked deeds unavoidably and completely catch up to perpetrators by coming back upon them sevenfold (Ps. 79:12; Sir. 7:3; 35:13; cf. also 20:12,14; 37:14). When caught, the thief must restore stolen goods by sevenfold (Prov. 6:31). In deviating from the legal regulations addressing theft in Ex. 21:37–22:3(Eng. 22:1-4), which demand two- to fivefold compensation,[146] Prov. 6:31 (cf. the second stich: "they will forfeit all the goods of their house") is not making the legal regulations more severe, but is rather lending expression to the comprehensive loss that theft involves (cf. also the LXX translation of 2 S. 12:6, *wᵉ'eṯ-hakkiḇśâ yᵉšallēm 'arba'tāyim,* as *kaí tḗn amnáda apoteísei heptaplasíona*).

---

140. *KTU* 1.41; de Tarragon, *Culte,* 17-20.

141. *WUS,* no. 2579; *KTU* 1.17, I, 31; II, 6, 20; cf. also Margalit, *Aqht,* 324, 328 on 1.18, I, 25; *šb'* II: 1.17, I, 5-16; II, 32-42.

142. W. Richter, *Die Bearbeitungen des "Retterbuches" in der deuteronomischen Epoche. BBB* 21 (1964), 41.

143. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. trans. 1984), 324.

144. See Wilson, 148-58; cf. Zimmern; Reiner.

145. See O. Margalith, "Samson's Riddle and Samson's Magic Locks," *VT* 36 (1986) 229-34.

146. See Otto, *Wandel,* 19-22.

The aspect of comprehensive completeness also makes the number seven significant in the blessings and curses concluding legal collections. Enemies who advance *one* way will end up fleeing in seven ways (Dt. 28:7); Israel will similarly advance on the enemy *one* way and end up fleeing in seven ways (v. 25).[147] Dt. 28:22 enumerates seven illnesses that will come with the curse.[148] G. Seitz[149] reconstructs in vv. 20-22,27-28,35 a series of fourteen (2 × 7) bodily plagues (cf. also the enumeration of illnesses, one deriving from incantation texts, in the curses of the *adê* oath at the accession of Esarhaddon).[150] Within the framework of a "plague intensification schema"[151] secondarily inserted into the execration list in Lev. 26, vv. 18,21, and 24 threaten sevenfold chastisement for transgressions. In Ex. 7–11 a Yahwist hand puts together seven plagues,[152] on which the plague sequences in Ps. 78:44-51 and 105:28-38 depend.[153]

In Gen. 4:15, too, use of the motif of the number seven is enhanced by the aspect of totality. Whoever slays Cain "will suffer a sevenfold vengeance."[154] With this motif of sevenfold vengeance, 4:15 by no means represents an "extremely ancient passage" articulating uncontrolled vengeance;[155] it expresses rather the comprehensive protection of life through the general preventive of divine sanction even for the person guilty of fratricide who has robbed himself of the protection of his brother. Only in the excessive increase to seventy-sevenfold vengeance in the Song of Lamech (v. 24) does the motif of God's comprehensive protection of life even for those without rights become the motif of human violence.

The aspect of totality also underlies the metaphor in Zech. 3:9 of the seven (pairs of) eyes *('înāyim)*[156] on a *single* stone, which is to be identified with the *'eḇen š^etîyâ* of creation[157] such that the seven eyes can survey creation. Zech. 4:2 and 10b then pick up

147. Concerning the combination of the numbers one and seven in curses in contractual texts in Sefire, see *KAI* 222A.21-24; 223A.1-2; cf. Cathcart, 46-47.

148. J. G. Plöger, *Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium. BBB* 26 (1967), 151-54.

149. *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium. BWANT* 93 (1971), 278-82.

150. L. 418a-b; cf. K. Watanabe, *Die adê-Vereidigung anlässlich der Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons. Baghdader Mitteilungen,* Beiheft 3 (1988), 33, 111, 162-63; cf. Shurpu IV, 83-85; Maqlû VII, 129-30.

151. Cholewiński, 129-30, 319.

152. See L. Schmidt, *Beobachtungen zu der Plagenerzählung in Exodus 7:14–11:10. StBib* 4 (1990), 69-77.

153. Schmidt, 86-96; cf. Loewenstamm, "Number"; on the motif of the seven plagues, cf. also Rev. 15:1ff.; on the motif of seventy plagues, see L.A.E. (Vita) 34.

154. See G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971), 124.

155. So W. Dietrich, "Rache: Erwägungen zu einem alttestamentlichen Thema," *EvT* 36 (1976) 460.

156. E. Lipiński, "Recherches sûr le livre de Zacharie," *VT* 20 (1970) 25-29: "sources"; NRSV "facets"; cf. by contrast W. Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja 1–8, 9–14, Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 101.

157. Mish. *Yoma* 5:2; Rudolph, *Sacharja,* 100-102; cf. the status of scholarship account in C. L. Meyers and E. M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8. AB* 25 (1987), 205-6.

and enhance this motif with the motif of the seven-times-seven places of illumination of seven lamps[158] each with seven lips.[159] The seven lamps are interpreted as Yahweh's eyes, which "range through the whole earth" (v. 10b). Seven squared expresses the totality of God's dominion over the earth as manifested in this gaze. Through the number seven, the lamps in Zech. 4:2 are related to seven-armed lampstand in Ex. 25:31-40 and Num. 8:2 that is identical with the lampstand from the Herodian period depicted on the Arch of Titus.[160] The number seven expresses the comprehensive illumination of the lampstand; only during the late Israelite period was the interpretation of this number expanded to include the planets.[161] Isa. 30:26 expresses the fullness of sunlight in the image of the sevenfold illumination of the moon and the splendor of the eschatological light in the image of the sevenfold illumination of the sun (cf. 1 En. 91:16).

The number seven acquires special significance in apocalyptic materials, where it designates a totality announcing the perfection of divine actions.[162] Examples include the seven archangels in 1 En. 20;[163] the seven spirits before the throne of God in Rev. 1:4; 4:5; the seven angels in Apoc. Mos. 40 (cf. Tob. 12:15); the seven men in white robes in T. Levi 8; the seven spirits of error in T. Reu. 2; the seventy shepherds in 1 En. 89:59-77; the seven (bronze) mountains in 1 En. 17:6; 24:1-3; 32:1-2; [70:3;] 77:4; the seven lampstands in Rev. 1:13ff. and seven stars in 1:16ff.; the seven seals in 5:1ff.; the seven trumpets in 8:2ff.; the seven thunders in 10:3-4;[164] the dragon with the seven heads and seven diadems in 12:3 (cf. 13:1; 17:3ff.); and the seven heavens in T. Levi 3; Apoc. Mos. 33.[165]

This element of comprehensive fullness and totality also explains the use of the number seven in connection with ceremony and ritual. In the ceremonial greeting in Gen. 33:1b-3,6-7,[166] the sevenfold bowing (33:3)[167] expresses total subjection just as the sevenfold repetition of God's praise expresses the sincerity of one's thanks. Rites of purification and atonement include sevenfold aspersion (Lev. 4:6,17; 8:11; 14:7,16,27,51; 16:14,19; Nu. 19:4; cf. 2 K. 4:35; 5:10,14). The late-exilic Dtr account of the conquest of Jericho draws on such thinking in portraying the sevenfold circum-

---

158. Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 1–8,* 229-34.

159. On seven-lipped oil lamps from Late Bronze Age Ugarit and Iron Age II Palestine, see North; H. Weippert, *BRL*², 200; cf. O. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst. SBS* 84/85 (1977), 274-80.

160. Cf. Eltester; M. Pfanner, *Der Titusbogen* (Mainz, 1983), 54, 72-74, ills. 54, 63, 1-7; L. Yarden, *Opuscula Romana* 14 (1983) 101-2.

161. Cf. Josephus, *B.J.* 5.217; *Ant.* 3.145; Philo, *Her.* 221-22; cf. *Mos.* 2.105; O. Böcher, *TRE,* IV, 302.

162. Cf. Rengstorf, *TNDT,* II, 632; Collins.

163. See S. Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch. JSHRZ* V/6 (1984), 552-53 n. 8.

164. See in this regard Day, *VT* 29 (1979) 145.

165. On the diminutive aspect of the number 3½ in apocalyptic (Dnl. 7:25; 12:7; Rev. 12:14) and rabbinic traditions, cf. G. Kittel, *Rabbinica* (Leipzig, 1920), 31-38; Gordis, 17-18; Gese, 399-422; on the function of the number seven in Jewish-Hellenistic apologetics, see N. Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos. TU* 86 (1964), 73, 150-71.

166. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. trans. 1985), 490-91.

167. See F. B. Knutson, *RSP,* II, 422.

vention of the city (Josh. 6:15bβ,16a [v. 4bα is post-Dtr]; cf. also 1 K. 18:43,44).[168] The number seven is also significant in connection with rituals in determining the number of sacrificial animals (cf. Gen. 21:28-30; Nu. 23:1,14,29; 28:11,27; 29:2,8,32,36; 1 Ch. 15:26; 2 Ch. 29:21). Multiples and enhancements include fourteen (Nu. 29:29,32), seventy (2 Ch. 29:32), seventy-seven (Ezra 8:35), seven hundred (2 Ch. 15:11), seven thousand (2 Ch. 15:11; 30:24), and seventy-seven hundred sacrificial animals (2 Ch. 17:11). Other associated numbers include one (Nu. 28:30; 29:8,34,36), two (Num. 28:11,27; 29:2;[169] concerning combinations with the numbers one hundred and two hundred, cf. 2 Ch. 29:32), and twelve (Ezra 8:35).

As in Akkadian and Ugaritic literature, in Israel too the number seventy expresses the special size of a group of people (Fensham). Jerubbaal/Gideon (Jgs. 8:30; 9:2,4-5,18,24,56) and Ahab (2 K. 10:1,6,7) each had seventy sons, and Abdon had forty sons and thirty grandsons who rode on seventy donkeys (Jgs. 12:14). The house of Jacob numbered seventy persons when it came into Egypt (Gen. 46:27; Ex. 1:5). The group of Israel's elders is said to have included the ideal number of seventy persons, which as a "number of totality" represented the totality of the people (Ex. 24:1,9; Nu. 11:16,24,25; Ezk. 8:11; etc.).[170]

The seven-day and seven-year periods function as temporal divisions. Jacob serves seven years each for Leah and Rachel (Gen. 29:18,20,27,30). Seven lean years (of famine) follow seven fat years (of plenty; Gen. 41:1-57).[171] The construction of the first temple took seven years (1 K. 6:38). The Flood begins seven days after its announcement (Gen.7:4,10), and Noah twice sends out doves at seven-day intervals to determine whether the waters have receded (Gen. 8:10,12). Mourning periods for the dead last seven days (Gen. 50:10; cf. Nu. 6:9; 19:11; 1 S. 31:13; 1 Ch. 10:12; Job 2:13; Jdt. 16:24; Sir. 22:12; restricted to six days in Apoc. Mos. 43; L.A.E. [Vita] 51). After a waiting period of seven days (Lev. 12:2), circumcision is performed on the eighth day after birth (Gen. 17:12; Lev. 12:2; cf. Ex. 22:29[30]; Lev. 22:27). Hebrew developed the term *šāḇûa'* as a designation for such seven-day periods,[172] which refers to typical units of seven quite independent of the calendrical week[173] such as periods of mourning (Dnl. 10:2-3). A person who lives seventy or eighty years is thought to have lived a long life (Ps. 90:10; Jub. 23:15-16; cf. Gen. 5:12; 11:26).[174] Such thinking can also be associated with the motif of the seventy-year exile[175] and destruction of Jerusalem

168. So Otto, *Mazzotfest,* 65-86.

169. See R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967), 115-16.

170. On the designation of the LXX, see H. M. Orlinsky, *Cambridge History of Judaism,* II (Cambridge, 1989), 538-40.

171. On Assyrian parallels, see Klein, 76-77; on Egyptian parallels, cf. *ANET,* 31-32; P. Barguet, *La stèle de la famine à Séhel. BIFAO* 24 (1953).

172. Koch, 406.

173. Robinson, 131.

174. See Malamat, 217.

175. See R. Borger, "An Additional Remark on P. R. Ackroyd, *JNES,* XVII, 23-27," *JNES* 18 (1959) 74.

(2 Ch. 36:21; Jer. 25:11-12; 29:10; Dnl. 9:2;[176] cf. Jer. 23:15-18), reminding the reader that none of the present generation will live to experience its end (cf. also Ex. 20:5; Dt. 5:9).[177]

Concerning heptadic periods of time, cf. seven days in Gen. 31:23; Ex. 7:25; Jgs. 14:12,17-18; 1 S. 10:8; 13:8; 2 S. 2:11; 5:5; 12:18; 1 K. 20:29; 2 K. 3:9; Est. 1:5,10; Tob. 11:19; Jdt. 16:24; 3 Mc. 6:30; 7:17; Ezk. 3:15,16; 4 Ezra 5:20,21; 6:35; 7:30,101; 2 Bar. 12:5; 20:5; 43:3; 47:2; T. Jud. 12:2; L.A.E. (Vita) 46; seventy days: T. Levi 8:1; seven months: 1 S. 6:1; Ezk. 39:12,14; T. Reu. 1:7-8; T. Naph. 6:1; seven years: Jgs. 6:1; 12:9; 2 S. 24:13; 1 K. 2:11; 2 K. 8:1-3; 11:4; 12:1,2(11:21; 12:1); 18:9; 1 Ch. 3:4; 29:27; 2 Ch. 24:1; Est. 2:16; Ezk. 39:9; seventy years: Zech. 1:12; 7:5; seventy-seven years: Asc. Mos. 3:14; seven hundred years: T. Benj. 7:3; seventy weeks of years: Dnl. 9:24;[178] seventy generations: 1 En. 10:12; ten weeks of the world for every seven generations: 1 En. 91:11-16; 93:3-10.[179]

The heptadic temporal division of seven days is of particular importance in cult and ritual. The earliest festival regulations (Ex. 23:15a; 34:18-20abα) already fix the duration of the Feast of Unleavened Bread at seven days, a regulation remaining stable even after the association of this feast with the Passover.[180] The Feast of Unleavened Bread is structured by a 1-6/7-day schema (cf. Ex. 13:6 [pre-Dtr]; Dt. 16:8).[181] From the perspective of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the heptadic system acquired significance for the entire Israelite festival calendar. The *šāḇuʿôṯ* (Feast of Weeks) is celebrated for seven times seven days after the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Passover; Lev. 23:15ff.; Dt. 16:9).[182] The Dtn reform program adapts the Feast of Booths to the Feast of Unleavened Bread/Passover by making it a seven-day festival.

The rhythm of seven also characterizes the redactional structure of the Dtn festival calendar in Dt. 16:1-7.[183] In the regulations for the three pilgrimage festivals in vv. 1-8,9-12,13-15, the number seven determines the temporal schema seven times: vv. 3,4,

---

176. See in this regard Plöger; M. Fishbane, "Revelation and Tradition-Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis," *JBL* 99 (1980) 356-58.

177. See in this regard F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. OBO* 45 (1982), 26ff.

178. See A. Laato, "The Seventy Yearweeks in the Book of Daniel," *ZAW* 102 (1990) 212-25; on the history of interpretation, see F. Fraidl, *Die Exegese der siebzig Wochen Daniels in der alten und mittleren Zeit* (Graz, 1883).

179. See Koch, 405ff., who also discusses the late Israelite theory of a period of four hundred ninety years between the exile and the eschaton; on the calendrical texts 4Q293; 317; 319-37 from Qumran, which deal with cycles of three, six, seven, and forty-nine years, see J. T. Milik, ed., *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford, 1976), 187; on Hebrew dating using the number seven, see *HAL*, III, 1400b (with bibliog.).

180. → XII, 9-14.

181. On the interpretation, see Cholewiński, 184-86; on the thesis of an eight-day Feast of Unleavened Bread (see Dt. 16:8), see H. G. May, "The Relation of the Passover to the Festival of Unleavened Cakes," *JBL* 55 (1936) 77; on this thesis and the significance of the number seven in this connection, see J. B. Segal, *The Hebrew Passover* (London, 1963), 83, 139, 177.

182. See II below.

183. See Braulik, "Die Funktion von Siebengruppierungen," 41.

šiḇʿaṯ yāmîm; v. 8, *yôm haššᵉḇîʿî;* v. 9a,b, *šiḇʿâ šāḇuʿôṯ;* vv. 13,15, *šiḇʿaṯ yāmîm.* In the festival regulations in Lev. 23:33-36(39-43), secondary redaction in v. 36b[184] and v. 39 enhances the length of the Feast of Booths within the X/X + 1 schema to seven/eight days with an *ʿᵃṣereṯ,* a "celebratory conclusion,"[185] on the eighth day in order to demonstrate the priority of the Feast of Booths over the Passover/Feast of Unleavened Bread.[186] Commensurate with the Dtn reform program, 1 K. 8:2 and 65a identify the temple dedication feast of the first temple with the seven-day Feast of Booths. 2 Ch. 7:8-9 associates the eight-day Feast of Booths with a seven-day temple dedication festival (1 K. 8:65b is a secondary accommodation). Finally, the seven-day period is also of central significance for the temporal structure of purificatory and atonement rituals (cf. Lev. 13:4-6,21,26,27,31-34,50,51,54; 14:38,39: skin disease; 15:13,19,24: hemorrhaging; 14:8,9,27: purificatory sacrifices; Ex. 29:37: altar atonement; Nu. 19:19; 31:24: water of purification [association of the third and seventh days]; Nu. 19:11,12,14,16; 31:19: defilement through contact with the dead [association of the third and seventh days]).

The origin of the institution of the seventh day as a day of rest is found in the sacral temporal structure of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 13:6; Dt. 16:8), which, while originally associated with the harvest, was expanded to include the time of plowing (Ex. 34:21b) and finally associated with the → שׁבת *šbt,* "Sabbath," ultimately affecting the temporal structure of the entire year (cf. Dt. 5:13,14aαbα; Ex. 20:9,10aα,b).[187] Institutions related to the six/seven temporal structure of the theology of separation associated with the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the day of rest include the temporal structure of six/seven years[188] in the regulations concerning the institutions of the fallow year in Ex. 23:10-11;[189] Dt. 15:1-6;[190] Lev. 25:1-7,[191] and the release of slaves in Ex. 21:2-11;[192] Dt. 15:12-18.[193] Lohfink[194] draws attention to the number of twice seven laws in Deuteronomy providing for those who do not own their own land (Dt. 5:14; 12,7,12,18; 14:26-27,29; 15:20; 16:11,14; 24:19,20,21; 26:11,12-13) and to the seven motivations deriving from the Egyptian experience (Dt. 5:15; 10:19; 15:15;

---

184. See Cholewiński, 205.

185. → XI, 314-15.

186. See Otto, *TRE,* XI, 101 (with bibliog.).

187. Cf. Robinson, 143ff.; Hossfeld, *Dekalog,* 247ff.; E. Otto, *TRE,* XI, 103-4; a different view in G. F. Hasel, "'New Moon and Sabbath' in Eighth Century Israelite Prophetic Writings," in M. Augustin and K.-D. Schunck, eds., *"Wünschet Jerusalem Frieden." BEATAJ* 13 (1988), 37-64.

188. Robinson, 111ff.

189. Cf. Otto, *Wandel,* 45-46; L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33). BZAW* 188 (1990), 391-93.

190. Cf. G. Braulik, *Deuteronomium 1–16. NEB* 15 (1986), 110-12; N. Lohfink, "Das deuteronomische Gesetz in der Endgestalt — Entwurf einer Gesellschaft ohne marginale Gruppen," *BN* 51 (1990) 32 n. 13.

191. See Cholewiński, 101-18, 218-51.

192. Cf. Otto, *Wandel,* 34-37; Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Bundesbuch,* 303-16.

193. See I. Cardellini, *Die biblischen "Sklaven"-Gesetze. BBB* 55 (1981), 269-76.

194. *BN* 51 (1990) 33-34.

7/+ 1 also characterizes the redaction in the fourth section of the book of Psalms (Ps. 90–106) within the composition of Ps. 93–100.[220] Concerning the heptadic structure of apocalyptic materials, cf. the seven visions of 4 Ezra.[221]

Within the Qumran writings, structures based on seven emerge in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice 4Q400-407, 11Q17, and MasShirShabb.[222] The composition of the three parts of songs 1–5; 6–8; 9–13 has its center in song 7.[223] Songs six (praise of the seven highest angelic princes) and eight (praise of the lesser princes) bracket song seven, which anticipates songs 9–13. The number seven determines both the structure and the content in each of the songs six, seven, and eight.[224]

Given the fluctuation of such culturally significant words as "seven" in connection with trade activities and cultural exchange, it makes little sense to attempt an etymology of the number *šeḇa'* restricted only to Hebrew. As in the dialects of East Semitic and Northwest Semitic, so also in Hebrew one can assume the presence of the paretymological phenomenon of isophony. Although Gen. 21:28ff. establishes a connection between *šb'*, "swear," and *šeḇa'*, this does not allow any etymological conclusions regarding the Proto-Semitic number *šb'*,[225] since *šb'*, "swear,"[226] is attested neither in East Semitic nor in Old Aramaic.[227] Neither, in a reverse fashion, can *šb'*, "swear," be derived from the numeral.[228] The notion of a fullness of witnesses to an oath is not associated with the number seven. The PNs Beer-sheba (Gen. 21:31; 26:33),[229] Bathsheba,[230] Elisheba,[231] and Jehosheba (Jehoshabeath)[232] still preserve the root *šb'*, "be full, sated, completed," as widely attested in the Semitic languages,[233] prior to the allophonic split *š/ś* in Hebrew.[234] Israel adopted the special significance of the number seven over the course of cultural history, a significance amplified by the sa-

---

220. Zenger, "Israel und Kirche," 240-42.

221. On the book of Revelation, see A. Farrer, *A Rebirth of Images: The Making of St. John's Apocalypse* (Boston, ²1963), 36-90.

222. See S. Segert, "Observations on Poetic Structures in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice," *Études Qumrâniennes. FS J. Carmignac. RevQ* 13 (1988) 215-33.

223. Cf. Newsom, *Songs*, 13-14; A. S. van der Woude, "Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974-1988)," *TRu* 55 (1990) 247-48.

224. On heptadic structures in rabbinic literature, cf. Rengstorff, *TDNT*, II, 629; Gordis, 21ff.

225. Contra M. R. Lehmann, "Biblical Oaths," *ZAW* 81 (1969) 74-92.

226. See A. Murtonen, *Hebrew in Its West Semitic Setting I/Bb-E* (Leiden, 1989), 409.

227. See C. A. Keller, "שׁבע *šb'* to swear," *TLOT*, III, 1292.

228. Contra Hehn, *Siebenzahl*, 85: *nišba'* = "'beseven' oneself."

229. See Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 349.

230. See J. J. Stamm, *Beiträge zur hebräischen und altorientalischen Namenkunde. OBO* 30 (1980), 120.

231. See J. D. Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew. JSOTSup* 49 (1988), 79, 361.

232. See ibid., 79, 361; J. A. Emerton, "Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew," *VT* 39 (1989) 247.

233. See Murtonen, 410; → שׂבע *śāḇa'*.

234. G. Garbini, "The Phonetic Shift of Sibilants in Northwestern Semitic in the First Millennium B.C.," *JNSL* 1 (1971) 32-38.

cral temporal structure of the great pilgrimage festivals and by the accommodation of the temporal structure to the Sabbath.

II. The Feast of Weeks.

1. *Pre-Deuteronomic Regulations in Ex. 34:22a; (23:16a).* The system of norms and laws in preexilic Israel derives from three originally independent legal sources: the family, local and state legal authority, and the cultic regulations of sanctuaries; only secondarily were these sources merged. The regulations for the *ḥag šāḇu'ôṯ,* the "Feast of Weeks," in Ex. 34:22a is part of the pre-Yahwist cultic regulation in Ex. 34:18-23,25*,26 whose structural elements are still quite distinct. Verses 18 and 21-23 constitute a self-enclosed festival regulation. The festival regulations in vv. 18 and 22 frame the regulation governing the seventh day as a day of rest, which in its own turn extends the sacral 6/7-day structure of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 13:6, pre-Dtr[235]) to include the time of plowing and harvesting, thus placing the fertility of the fields under Yahweh's rule.[236] The *ḥag šāḇu'ôṯ* is associated with these seven-day periods. The seven-day periods that give the one-day festival its name determine the structure of the time of the barley and wheat harvests between *ḥag hammaṣṣôṯ* and *ḥag šāḇu'ôṯ,* combining the two festivals with one another. Ex. 34:23 summarizes and concludes the festival regulation (cf. 1 K. 9:25). This festival regulation is structured by the threefold use of the number seven, *šiḇ'aṯ yāmîm* (v. 18), *bayyôm hašš^eḇî'î* (v. 21), and *ḥag šāḇu'ôṯ* (v. 22), as well as by the combination of seven regulations (v. 18: *tišmōr, tō'ḵal;* v. 21: *ta'^aḇōḏ, tišbōṯ* [bis]; v. 22: *ta'^aśeh;* v. 23: *yērā'eh*), with a focus on the double *tišbōṯ* of the commandment ordering a day of rest. The festival regulation includes an addendum, namely, a pre-Yahwist sacrificial regulation in Ex. 34:25a,b (*happāsaḥ* is a Dtr addendum[237]),26b, bracketed by v. 26a,[238] and an insertion, namely, the regulations regarding the firstborn in Ex. 34:19-20, bracketed by v. 20bβ. Yahwistic redaction makes the tradition in Ex. 34:18-23,25,26, already present as part of Yahwistic initial redaction, into part of a tradition regarding privilege by connecting it with vv. 10b (10a is a post-Dtr addendum),11a (11b is Dtr),12,16 (17 is Dtr;[239] v. 24 is Dtr[240]).[241] The festival regulation of the *ḥag šāḇu'ôṯ* in Ex. 34:22a is to be interpreted as part of the pre-Yahwistic festival regulations encompassing Ex. 34:18,21,22,23. Although the adverbial qualification *bikkûrê q^eṣîr ḥiṭṭîm,* "(time of the) firstfruits of wheat harvest," as a designation of time is the necessary indication of date, as a modal qualification it also

235. Cf. Cholewiński, 182 n. 18 (bibliog.); Braulik, *TP* 56 (1981) 345 nn. 34, 38; → XII, 14-16.

236. Robinson, 126ff.

237. → XII, 16-17.

238. Cf. O. Keel, *Das Böcklein in der Milch seiner Mutter und Verwandtes. OBO* 33 (1980), 40ff.; Halbe, 201-2.

239. See C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot. Seine Entstehung und seine Entwicklung im AT. BBB* 62 (²1987), 180-84.

240. Concerning the separation from v. 23, cf. W. Richter, *Recht und Ethos. SANT* 15 (1966), 99.

241. See in this regard Hossfeld, *Dekalog,* 204ff.

implies a regulation regarding festival gifts. It stipulates that the one-day festival was celebrated at the beginning of the wheat harvest. The preceding commandment regarding the day of rest as well as the designation of the festival as a festival of seven-day periods suggests that the festival date fell on one of the days of rest of those seven-day periods between the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the Feast of Weeks whose number was determined by the status of the harvest.

With its salvific-historical basis, the fixed festival date, and the 6/7-day structure, the Feast of Unleavened Bread lends expression to the priority this festival enjoyed over the harvest in the sense that the harvest period, structured by the seven-day periods deriving from the Feast of Unleavened Bread itself, is a function of the festival rather than the festival being a function of the harvest.[242] Because the festival date depends on the status of the grain in the fields, the Feast of Weeks is more closely tied to the actual harvest. The specific characteristic of the festival, however, the placement of the harvest under Yahweh's dominion in the separation of the seventh day of the seven-day period, positions the festival within the horizon of the theology of the Feast of Unleavened Bread and its accompanying evocation of the experience of the exodus. The name of the festival, *ḥag šāḇu'ôṯ*, articulates the specific theological characteristic of this festival — one grounded in the Feast of Unleavened Bread — in the theology of the separation of the seven-day periods. The probability that there was a pre-Israelite festival designation following the Ugaritic tradition of periods based on the number seven in the sense of a "Feast of Fullness" is difficult to demonstrate.[243] The key theological idea in the festival designation is not the fullness of the harvest, but God's dominion over that harvest as the initiator of all fertility. Although the theological profile of this festival as one of separation can already be discerned in the pre-Yahwistic tradition, attempts to associate the celebration of the Feast of Weeks with the recitation of concrete traditions of a creed encompassing hexateuchal themes[244] or the Decalog[245] remain hypothetical.

Ex. 34:18-26* has a parallel in the festival regulations in 23:14-19.[246] The traditio-historical relationship between these two traditions is assessed differently. E. Aurelius interprets 34:10-27 as (post)exilic/late-Dtr with the adoption of 23:14-19 from the "Covenant Code."[247] The presupposition that 23:14-19 was part of a pre-Dtr "Covenant Code," however, presents problems. The thesis of a basic stratum or collection regard-

---

242. See E. Otto, *TRE,* XI, 96-97.

243. Laaf, 177-78.

244. G. von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. trans., New York, 1966), §7: "The Origin of the 'Settlement Tradition,'" 41-48.

245. Weinfeld, "Decalogue," 26ff.

246. For a synopsis see Otto, *Mazzotfest,* 241-49.

247. *Der Fürbitter Israels. CBOT* 27 (1988), 105ff., 116ff.; cf. also W. Johnstone, "Reactivating the Chronicles Analogy in Pentateuchal Studies," *ZAW* 99 (1987) 28; "The Decalogue and the Redaction of the Sinai Pericope in Exodus," *ZAW* 100 (1988) 363; E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch. BZAW* 189 (1990), 67-70, 369-75: a redaction of the D composition.

ginning of the Passover (Unleavened Bread) festival week to the new moon *(ḥōḏeš)*[254] of Abib. Verse 8, which was appended to the Dtn festival regulations for Passover (Unleavened Bread), articulates the temporal structure of this festival in a 6/7-day schema and transitions to the following regulations for the Feast of Weeks in vv. 9-10. Verse 9 is chiastically structured and framed by *šiḇ'â šāḇu'ôṯ* and picks up on v. 8. After the *'ᵃṣereṯ* on the seventh day of the Feast of Passover (Unleavened Bread), the barley harvest begins in the month of Abib[255] and with it the counting of the seven *šāḇu'ôṯ*[256] at whose end on the fifty-sixth day and eighth day of rest after the new moon of Abib the *ḥag haššāḇu'ôṯ* (definite article, v. 16) is to be celebrated (v. 10aα). The centralization of the pilgrimage festival no longer allows for any dependence of the festival date on the current status of the grain in the fields. This determination now severs the festival date from the beginning of the wheat harvest and moves it to its end.[257] In the Gezer Calendar the feasts *pesaḥ-maṣṣôṯ* and *šāḇu'ôṯ* encompass the period called *yrḥ qṣr ś'rm*, "month of the barley harvest," and *yrḥ qṣr w[kl]*, "month of harvesting and [measuring]" (cf. also Ruth 2:23; Jer. 5:24).[258] Hence there is no need to assume that the Feast of Weeks was a family festival within the Dtn festival regulations in contrast to Passover (Unleavened Bread), which addressed all of Israel as its festival subject.

The displacement of the festival date to the end of the wheat harvest replaces the gift of the firstfruits of the wheat harvest (Ex. 34:22a[23:16a]) with a freewill offering "in proportion to the blessing," i.e., the yield, of the harvest (Dt. 16:10aβb). In contrast to the festival regulations of the Feast of Passover (Unleavened Bread), those for the Feast of Weeks mention no specific cultic observances and especially no cultic meal, perhaps a reflection of the conscious resistance to canaanizing interpretations of the harvest festival.[259] But since the pre-Dtn interpretation of the festival within the framework of the festival calendar in Ex. 34 already underscored the particular theological feature of the festival in a theology of separation, one can assume that the cultic observances, in contrast to those of the Feast of Passover (Unleavened Bread), were not really mediated through this particular feature and as a result did not become part of the regulations. The Dtn interpretation (Dt. 16:10b) views joy in Yahweh's blessing as the essence of this festival. The centralization of the cult (Dt. 16:11b) removes the boundaries of familial and regionally restricted festival communities. In its festival joy *(śmḥ)* before Yahweh (v. 11aα; cf. 12:12; 26:11; associated with a sacrificial meal in 12:7,18; 14:26; 27:7), Israel is constituted as a community (v. 11aβ) including children and the legally disadvantaged, slaves, Levites, orphans, and widows, thus removing the limitations restricting the festival community to merely the male citizens (Ex. 34:23; [23:17]) and cultically dissolving social and legal distinctions within Israel.[260] This

254. See Robinson, 130-31; → חדשׁ *ḥāḏāš (chādhāsh)*, IV, 235.
255. See Borowski, 36-37.
256. See Morgenstern, *HUCA* 10 (1935), 13, 35, 47; Auerbach, 11.
257. See in this regard *AuS*, I/2, 462.
258. *KAI* 182.4,5; cf. Borowski, 40; also Haran, *Temples*, 295.
259. See Braulik, *TP* 56 (1981) 352.
260. See N. Lohfink, *BN* 51 (1990) 29ff.

6. *The Feast of Weeks in Late Israelite and Early Jewish Traditions.* a. *The Date.* The different dates for the Feast of Weeks proposed in late Israelite and early Jewish circles derive from the different interpretations of *mimmoḥºraṯ haššabbāṯ* in Lev. 23:(12),15, interpretations leading to differing solutions to the mediation of the festival calendar with the week-based structure that was not really carried through in the biblical tradition itself. The Sadducees and Samaritans identify the Sabbath with the weekly Sabbath in the week of Unleavened Bread, so that the counting begins with the first Sunday of that week and the Feast of Weeks itself always falls on the Sunday *mimmoḥºraṯ haššabbāṯ hašš*ᵉ*ḇî'iṯ* (Lev. 23:16).[270] The interpretation of the Pharisees (cf. Bab. *Yoma* 4b) identifies the Sabbath with the fifteenth day of the first month, so that the counting begins on the sixteenth day of the first month and ends on the sixth day of the third month, an interpretation also followed by Lev. 23:11 LXX with *tḗ epaúrion tḗs prṓtēs,* Lev. 23:11,15 Tg., as well as by Philo and Josephus.[271] Hence the Pharisaic dating probably reflects the late Israelite praxis during the period of the second temple.[272] In the festival calendars of the book of Jubilees and of Qumran, the presentation of the sheaf offering falls on the first day of the first week after the end of the Unleavened Bread week, i.e., on the Sunday of the twenty-sixth day of the first month, *haššabbāṯ* being understood as the week fixed in this solar calendar.[273] Counting from the twenty-sixth day of the first month, the Feast of Weeks falls consistently (cf. Jub. 6:38; 11QPsª 27:6) on the Sunday of the fifteenth day of the third month (cf. Jub. 14:1,10; 15:1).[274] This calendar severs the Feast of Weeks as the primary festival of the festival cycle from the Feast of Passover (Unleavened Bread).

b. *Association with the Revelation of the Law.* During the postexilic period, Priestly theology shifted the date of both the making of the covenant and the giving of the Torah to the third month and thus into proximity with the Feast of Weeks (Ex. 19:1; 2 Ch. 15:10-14).[275] Ex. 19:10 Tg. and 24:1 Tg. date the giving of the Torah to the sixth day of the third month, i.e., to the Feast of Weeks according to Pharisaic reckoning, and the making of the covenant to the seventh day of the third month. Nu. 28:36 Tg. Onq. and Tg. Ps.-J. accordingly refer to the Feast of Weeks *šb'wtykm* as *'ṣrt,* "assembly" (so also Dt. 16:10 Tg. Neof.; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.252). By inserting *bḥg' dšbw'y',* 2 Ch. 15:11 Tg. dates the making of the covenant under King Asa to the Feast of Weeks as an "oath feast" (cf. vv. 14-15; cf. Jub. 6:21; 11QT 19:9). The Mekilta[276] reverses the biblical sequence of the giving of the Torah and the making of the covenant and dates the latter in Ex. 34:3ff. to the fifth day of the third month and the former to the sixth day of the third month.[277] Since tannaitic and rabbinic discussions then follow this sequence of making

270. See H. Lichtenstein, "Die Fastenrolle," *HUCA* 8-9 (1931/32) 276-77.
271. Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 2.162; Josephus, *Ant.* 3.10.5-6.
272. Safrai, 233-34.
273. See Potin, I, 121.
274. Van Goudoever, *Calendars,* 62-70.
275. Cf. Delcor, 866; Kutsch, "Herbstfest," 154-57.
276. See K. Hruby, "La révélation dans la théologie rabbinique," *L'Orient Syrien* 11 (1966) 175.
277. See Potin, I, 132-34.

of the covenant and giving of the Torah in its deviation from the biblical materials, dating the giving of the Torah to the seventh day of the third month (Bab. *Šabb.* 86b; *Yoma* 4b), the making of the covenant then falls on the sixth day of the third month of the Feast of Weeks. The book of Jubilees also presupposes this sequence. The revelation of the commandments begins on the sixteenth day of the third month (Jub. 1:2), the day after the making of the covenant at the Feast of Weeks on the fifteenth day of the third month (6:17). On this festival day the Noachian covenant is renewed (6:1-22), just as Abraham had done in an exemplary fashion (14:10-20; 15:1).

In Qumran the *bᵉrîṯ* renewal (1QS 1:16–3:12) is celebrated at the Feast of Weeks.[278] Not until the amoraic-rabbinic tradition (Bab. *Pesaḥ.* 68b; cf. *Seder 'Olam Rabba* 5) is the Feast of Weeks associated with the giving of the Torah.[279]

Otto

---

278. Cf. Haag, "Qumrangemeinde," 130-31; on 4Q266 see J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea. SBT* 1/26 (1959), 113ff.; Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, ed., *The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language. Materials for the Dictionary,* Series I (Jerusalem, 1988), 189-98.

279. On the Samaritan association of the Feast of Weeks with the giving of the Torah, see A. E. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy,* I (Oxford, 1909), 406ff.

שָׁבַר *šāḇar;* שֶׁבֶר *šeḇer;* מַשְׁבֵּר *mašbēr;* מִשְׁבָּר *mišbār*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. 1. Objects; 2. Subjects; 3. Usage. III. God as Subject. IV. 1. Meaning of the Verbal Stems; 2. Breaking the Staff of Bread; 3. Breaking the Yoke; 4. Breaking Bones. V. Developments. VI. Substantives: 1. *šeḇer:* a. Translation; b. Scope; 2. *mašbēr;* 3. *mišbār.* VII. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX.

šāḇar. R. Bach, ". . . der Bogen zerbricht, Spiesse zerschlägt und Wagen mit Feuer verbrennt," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 13-26; G. A. Barton, "'A Bone of Him Shall Not Be Broken': John 19:36," *JBL* 49 (1930) 13-19; B. Becking, "'Wie Töpfe sollst du sie zerschmeissen.' Mesopotamische Parallelen zu Ps 2,9b," *ZAW* 102 (1990) 59-79; O. García de la Fuente, "Sobre la idea de contrición en el antiguo testamento," in J. Coppens et al., eds., *Sacra Pagina. BETL* 12-13 (1959), I, 559-79, esp. 573ff.; J. Henninger, "Zum Verbot des Knochenzerbrechens bei den Semiten," *Studi orientalistici. FS G. Levi della Vida,* I (Rome, 1956), 448-58; H. Irsigler, "Äquivalenz in Poesie. Die kontextuellen Synonyme *ṣᵉʿaqā — yᵉlālā — šibr gadu(w)l* in Zef 1,10c.d.e," *BZ* 22 (1978) 221-35; K. Kohler, "Verbot des Knochenzerbrechens," *ARW* 13 (1910) 153-54; A. Scheiber, "Ihr sollt kein Bein dran zerbrechen," *VT* 13 (1963) 95-97; J. Schoneveld, "Het breken van de staf des broods," *NedTT* 27 (1973) 132-45; F. J. Stendebach, "Das Verbot des Knochenzerbrechens bei den Semiten," *BZ* 17 (1973) 29-38.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *šbr* is found throughout the Semitic languages.[1] In East Semitic, Akk. *šebēru(m)* is attested from Old Akkadian *(śabārum)*[2] on into Neo-Assyrian *(šabāru)* and South Babylonian, the semantic spectrum extending from the concrete breaking of objects (e.g., weapons, wooden objects, furniture, door bolts, bones, wings, cultic images), to pars pro toto usage in which the breaking of body parts refers to illnesses or defects, on to metaphorical usage in the sense of "destroy, annihilate." The same semantic field recurs with various nuances and modifications in West Semitic witnesses, including among Northwest Semitic Can. *šbr* (apart from Hebrew also in Phoenician, in Karatepe[3]) and *ṯbr* (in Ugaritic[4]), also Aram. *tbr* (in various dialects[5]), though also *šbr* in Old Aramaic;[6] Southwest Semitic includes Northern Arab. *ṯabara,* corresponding to OSA *ṯbr,* alongside Eth./Tigr. *sabara.* The root derives from Proto-Semitic **ṯbr,* whose nonemphatic interdental *ṯ* commensurately recurs in *š, ṯ, t,* or *s.*[7]

Although one can no longer determine unequivocally whether Heb. *šbr* II/*šeḇer* II represent a unique semantic development of *šbr* I or derive from a different basis entirely,[8] the following considerations can be mentioned. M. Ellenbogen is probably correct in doubting that *šeḇer* II, "grain," derives from *šbr* I, since *šeḇer* is itself probably a primary noun. Ellenbogen suggests instead deriving *šeḇer,* "grain," from Sum. *ŠIBIR* and Akk. *šibirru.* He also objects to a derivation from Egyp. *šb',* "eat," or *šb.w,* "nourishment, sacral meal."[9] S. Rin believes that *šbr,* "eat, feed," derives from Ugar. *ṯbr qnh,* basing his proposal on, among other things, his own translation of 1 K. 13:28: "The lion had not eaten the body or devoured *(šbr)* the donkey."[10] Rin cannot adduce Ps. 104:11 (MT) because of scribal error.

M. Fishbane demonstrates a relationship with Akk. *šubrû* with regard to both use and morphology in Jgs. 7:15 and suggests the translation "reveal"; similarly also W. Richter, who adduces Akk. *šabru,* "seer," and understands *šbr* in Jgs. 7:15 as an interpretive formula (for dreams).[11] Hence Even-Shoshan correctly lists Jgs. 7:15 independently as a witness for *šbr* III.[12]

---

1. See G. Bergsträsser, *Intro. to the Semitic Languages* (Eng. trans., Winona Lake, Ind., 1983), 220-21.
2. *AHw,* III, 1206-7, 1590.
3. See *KAI* 26A.I.8.
4. Cf. *WUS,* no. 2834; *UT,* no. 2642; M. J. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 377, no. 598; II, 13 (no. 17), 33 (no. 66).
5. Cf. *DNSI,* II, 1105-6; Beyer, 721.
6. *KAI* 222A.38.
7. See S. Moscati, *An Intro. to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. PLO* 6 (1969), 27-30, §§8.11-20; on the phonetic problem between interdentals and sibilants, cf. W. von Soden, "Die Spirantisierung von Verschlusslauten im Akkadischen," *JNES* 27 (1968) 214-20.
8. On this discussion see *HAL,* IV, 1404-5.
9. M. Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the OT* (London, 1962), 157.
10. "Ugaritic-OT Affinities," *BZ* 7 (1963) 24.
11. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1985), 456-57; Richter, "Traum und Traumdeutung im AT," *BZ* 7 (1963) 214-15.
12. Even-Shoshan, 2067.

against Israel when he breaks Israel's "staff of bread" and for Israel when he breaks Israel's "yoke."[25]

III. God as Subject. When God acts on Israel's behalf and breaks its yoke, he frees Israel from its bonds (Jer. 30:8; Nah. 1:13), from servitude (Jer. 30:8), and from tyranny (Isa. 14:5), and hence Israel can again "walk erect" (Lev. 26:13). Israel's adversaries mentioned by name include Egypt (Ezk. 30:18), Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. 28:11), and Babylon (Jer. 28:2,4). When God acts against Israel, the consequences are terrible. References to the breaking of the staff of bread also mention misfortunes ranging from famine (*rā'āḇ,* Ps. 105:16,33; Ezk. 5:16) to eradication (*kārat̠,* Ezk. 14:13).

Independent of references to the yoke and the staff of bread, other statements describe God's positive as well as his negative actions.

1. The shepherd motif (Ezk. 34:16) associates *šbr* with "binding up (wounds)" *(ḥāḇaš).* That is, God provides for an undamaged physical condition when he binds wounds *(ḥāḇaš 'aṣṣeḇet̠)* and heals *(rāp̄ā')* what is broken (cf. Ps. 147:3; Isa. 61:1, by means of an emissary). God even promises the birth of a new people (Isa. 66:8-9).[26]

2. Negative actions include God threatening to break the *'am* and the city "as one breaks a potter's vessel, so that it can never be mended" (Jer. 19:11). God intends to destroy Israel's politics of alliance — expressed in the image of the wall (Isa. 30:14)[27] — like "a potter's vessel," without mercy and so completely that not even the shards can be used.

God's actions are thus described in various ways, presumably according to the historical situation and intention of the author. In references to the private sphere, authors are especially inclined to draw on imagery associated with the body or illness (Ps. 34:21[20]).[28] By contrast, the new goal of God's global actions is to end wars and destroy all war materiel (Ps. 46:10[9]; 76:4[3]; 107:16; Hos. 2:20[18]).

IV. 1. *Meaning of the Verbal Stems.* The notion of "breaking" is expressed by the verbal stems in the qal, niphal, and piel (the hiphil and hophal once each).

In the qal (52 times), *šbr* refers to the elimination of oppression (14 times), the destruction of parts of human or animal bodies (12 times), the breaking of people or of groups of people and of war materiel (8 times each). The "breaking of jars" is expressed 4 times in the qal. Job 38:10; Ps. 29:5; and Isa. 42:3 expand the use of the qal by adding three new objects: bounds, cedars, and reeds. One noteworthy observation is that although the qal can be used in many different expressions, including those otherwise formulated in the niphal and piel, it is the only stem used in reference to the breaking of the "staff of bread" (5 times).

---

25. See below, IV.2, 3.

26. See C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 419.

27. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. trans. 2002), 153.

28. On Lam. 3:4, H.-J. Kraus, *Klagelieder (Threni). BK* XX ([4]1983), 60, suggests that the combination with *billā'* refers to a serious illness that is not, however, to be understood as a reference to an individual.

The niphal of *šbr* occurs 58 times in various contexts, though with noticeable frequency in connection with breaking parts of human or animal bodies (20 times), people or groups of people (17 times), and war materiel (9 times). The remaining 12 occurrences are divided between 7 different objects.

The piel of *šbr* is used 37 times in connection with objects of religious significance or with cultic objects (21 times), with war materiel (7 times), and with organs of the body (5 times). Occasional references are made to the breaking of trees (twice), rocks (1 K. 19:11), and the heads of dragons (Ps. 74:13). The considerable difference in the number of occurrences shows that, in the piel, use of *šbr* is concentrated on objects with religious significance, especially as such involves the elimination of cultic objects inimical to God. One can also demonstrate that the piel passages exhibit an explicitly religious character, the exceptions being Ex. 9:25; Job 29:17; Dnl. 8:7.

The suggestion of *HAL*[29] that the verbal stem depends on the material composition of its objects (qal: "only items which can be actually broken"; piel: "objects made of stone and metal . . which cannot actually be broken in one action but as a result of some other wasting process"[30]) cannot be maintained; the overlapping among objects is too considerable if one compares according to categories of objects that can be broken easily (immediately) or only with difficulty (mediately). The qal is used to express the destruction of materials of a physiological nature such as people, organs of the body, and trees (altogether 22 times) and pottery (4 times), i.e., materials that are easily broken. By contrast, the breaking of war materiel occurs 9 times. The niphal is used 42 times in connection with objects that are easily broken (39 times in connection with material of a physiological nature; 3 times with the breaking of vessels), countered by 11 occurrences associated with objects that are difficult to break (in 9 instances war materiel; twice cultic objects). The piel is used not only in reference to breaking harder material such as cultic objects (21 times) and war materiel (7 times), but also in connection with substances of a physiological nature (7 times). Moreover, the removal of stone altars *(mizbᵉḥôṯ),* i.e., of cultic objects, is expressed not only by *šbr* piel but also by *nṯṣ* in both the qal and piel.

Hence the biblical authors' conscious use of the various stems must be explained on the basis of the relationship between the stems themselves.

The qal and piel of *šbr* differ in that the qal refers to the current action of "breaking" while the piel emphasizes that which brings about the result of "making something broken" and is thus resultative.[31] The goal of the piel statement is that cultic objects inimical to God be definitively broken and that weapons of war be destroyed once and for all (cf. Ps. 46:10[9]; 76:4[3]). The second distinction is that the qal's reference is more punctiliar than that of the piel.

If one juxtaposes *šbr* niphal and qal (as well as piel), the niphal differs in that no agent is mentioned. Moreover, that which in the qal and piel constitutes the object (of

29. *HAL,* IV, 1402.
30. See *HP,* 181.
31. See *IBHS,* 399-400, 405.

breaking) becomes the subject in niphal statements, acquiring thereby a double status, namely, as "actor and patient of the action,"[32] and raising the question regarding the (co-)initiator of the action of breaking. Instead of explicitly naming the initiator, Dnl. 8:25 and 11:22, for example, state who it is not. As a rule, the context of *šbr* niphal does suggest an initiator (cf. Isa. 24:10; Jer. 50:23; 51:8,30; Ezk. 6:4,6; 30:8), as also applies to a sequence of events the first of which mentions an initiator or a causal factor while the following *šbr* niphal is then not directly or is only loosely associated with that initiator/cause (Isa. 8:15; 27:11; 28:13; Ezk. 31:12). The double status of the niphal leaves the initiator unnamed, thus making it possible to insert one interpretively. The initiator can be God (e.g., 2 Ch. 20:37; Ezk. 6:4,6; cf. also Job 38:15; Dnl. 8:25; 11:20; passages lacking any interest in the initiator include Ezk. 26:2 and 27:34). Assuming God to be the initiator is possible only through interpretation deriving from faith, since no concrete connection can be demonstrated between "being broken" and God. Such association must be supplied by the author and reader, which is why the niphal is frequently used to express theologically the *passivum divinum* in the sense "you are broken (and God initiated it)."

2. *Breaking the Staff of Bread.* The expression "breaking the staff of bread" occurs in Lev. 26:26; Ps. 105:16; Ezk. 4:16; 5:16; 14:13, though just what the "staff of bread" really was is still a matter of dispute. References to "breaking the staff[33] of bread" are made only in connection with famine (explicitly in Ps. 105:16; Ezk. 5:16; 14:13; implicitly in Lev. 26:20,29; Ezk. 4:16; cf. vv. 9-16[34]).

L. Köhler suggests that the "staff of bread" was an instrument used for storage; ring-shaped breads were threaded onto the staff so they could be stored out of the reach of mice.[35] H. Schult adds to this explanation by proposing that the "staff of bread" might have been a carrying pole.[36] These explanations, however, do not really address the situation of distress one senses in these passages. The identification with a carrying pole is refuted by Nu. 13:23 and 1 Ch. 15:15, which designate the carrying pole with the specific term *môṭ* or *môṭâ* (+ prep. *'al*).

Not only does this praxis-oriented interpretation not fit, neither does the suggestion that the "staff of bread" represents an instrument used by the baker, since preparation of the dough did not require a pole as an instrument; first, the dough was kneaded by hand, and second, it was prepared only in small quantities in any case. (As a rule, only enough bread was baked to cover daily needs.[37]) Neither was a special pole or staff required for baking; practically any small, readily available pole suitable for turning and

32. Ibid., 380; cf. 381.

33. → מטה *maṭṭeh.*

34. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 169-70.

35. "Alttestamentliche Wortforschung: Loch- und Ringbrot," *TZ* 4 (1948) 154-55; both *HAL*, II, 573, and H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), on Ps. 105, concur with this interpretation.

36. "Marginale zum 'Stab des Brotes,'" *ZDPV* 87 (1971) 206.

37. See M. Kellermann, *BRL*^{2}, 29.

draft animal's head; they were then firmly strapped to the head with cords (cf. Jer. 27:2).[47] As such they came to symbolize a loss of freedom.[48] Jer. 28 *(scriptio defectiva)* may be referring to these yoke hooks (with Zwickel, contra *GesB*).

Alongside the "yoke," reference is also made to "breaking the staff" (*maṭṭeh,* Isa. 14:5; Jer. 48:18; and according to the MT also Nah. 1:13 and Ezk. 30:18; and *šēḇeṭ,* Isa. 14:29). For H. Wildberger,[49] *maṭṭeh* in Isa. 14:5 symbolizes the "power of the one who is ruling," and is to be understood as originally representing a divining rod with magical power.[50] Nah. 1:13 associates *maṭṭeh* with the expression "snapping bonds" *(nāṯaq môsᵉrôṯ).* Isa. 14:5 parallels the stick with the scepter of tyrants *(šēḇeṭ mōšᵉlîm).* One thus sees how Israel perceived not only this foreign rule, but also that from which Israel was then liberated, namely, from foreign powers and from the coercion and tyranny they imposed.

The scepter *(šēḇeṭ)* symbolized the power of the ruler.[51] Its "breaking" accordingly means liberation from foreign rule.

The definition of *ʿōl* as a "yoke, bent wood used for harnessing,"[52] indicates the consequences of foreign rule, namely, being harnessed in front of someone else's cart; one must serve that person. Jer. 30:8 speaks of serving *(ʿāḇaḏ)* and of bonds *(môsᵉrôṯ),* Isa. 14:25 about burdens *(ṣōḇel).* Lev. 26:13 intensifies this imagery in its assertion that such servitude to foreigners and the attendant loss of freedom lead to walking stooped.

Such rule, however, can also be exercised by the Israelites themselves, in Isa. 14:29 over the Philistines. Within Israel as well, bad shepherds (Ezk. 34:27) exercise such rule with "bars of a yoke" while demanding servitude *(ʿōḇᵉḏîm).* Jer. 2:20 and 5:5 speak about a different yoke. Here Israel or the great men of Israel perceive God's divine greatness as an *ʿōl* and wish to break the bonds God has imposed and no longer serve him, thus turning away from God's path and God's justice *(mišpāṭ).*[53] The image of the *ʿōl* alludes not to the recalcitrance of a stubborn ox, but rather to Israel's own unwillingness to submit to God.[54]

4. *Breaking Bones.* "Breaking bones" in connection with the Passover lamb is attested in Ex. 12:46; Nu. 9:12. Barton sees the origin of this sacrificial regulation in an ancient Semitic practice of cannibalism, with the rule emphasizing blood and bones as the seat of life.[55] Kohler offers two explanations: (a) because the animal is a substitution for child sacrifice, its bones may not be broken so that the redeemed child's bones

47. *GesB,* 404; W. Zwickel, "Jochhaken," *BN* 57 (1991) 37.
48. See Zwickel, 39.
49. *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. trans. 1997), 57.
50. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 416.
51. Ibid.; *GesB,* 801.
52. *GesB,* 589.
53. See S. Herrmann, *Jeremia. BK* XII/2 (1986), 139.
54. See ibid., 139-40.
55. Barton, 16-17.

also not be broken; (b) so that an animal might be revivified, its bones may not be broken.[56] Henninger assumes the presence of such faith in revivification of which the Semites were actually no longer conscious and whose traces are discernible only in Ps. 31; 32; 34; 51; 53; Lam. 3:4; Ezk. 37.[57] Adducing the same passages and following Henninger's lead, G. Stemberger associates magical analogy[58] with rebirth aimed at preserving the species.[59] Scheiber adduces pots and jars found in Qumran filled with animal bones, which he explains as being associated with belief in the resurrection of the animals.[60] He also draws attention to the parallel in Jub. 49:13 ("its head with the innards thereof and its feet they shall roast with fire, and not break any bone thereof; for of the children of Israel no bone shall be crushed"). Scheiber finds in this verse an apotropaism.

The OT passages adduced by Henninger and then by Stemberger to prove such belief in revivification (of animals), however, mention people, not animals, and thus cannot be applied to Ex. 12 and Nu. 9. Nor do the Qumran jars prove anything, since in no instance do the bones found in them yield a complete skeleton,[61] whereas according to all the parallels from the history of religions, resurrection or awakening of the dead presupposes the intactness and completeness of the skeleton. Moreover, the localizing of the life force in the bones need not be associated with the idea of revivification (though such does seem to be the case in Ezk. 37). Finally, behind all these attempts at providing a solution there remains the question whether an OT notion of resurrection in intact form provided the basis for Jn. 19:36 (cf. Kohler).

Rather than turning to parallels from the history of religions,[62] K.-M. Beyse draws on materials from the OT itself in attempting a solution.[63] Because Ex. 12:4 requires an undivided company,[64] so also should the Passover lamb be undivided — none of its bones may be "divided." Ex. 12:46, however, contains instructions for the meal[65] rather than for the preparations, as in v. 9. Moreover, the complex textual history of Ex. 12 also prohibits this explanation. Verse 46 is ascribed to P[66] or to its secondary addenda[67] and is viewed as the reworking of an earlier[68] tradition of a blood rite.[69] The regulation picked up by P is viewed as a "pre-Mosaic order"[70] or as a nomadic regulation.[71]

---

56. Kohler, 153-54.
57. Henninger, 456-57.
58. See Kohler, 153.
59. See Stendebach, 36-37.
60. Scheiber, 95-96.
61. See ibid., 96.
62. For overviews see Henninger and Stendebach.
63. → עצם *'eṣem,* XI, 307-8.
64. See *AncIsr,* 21.
65. See M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 101.
66. See P. Laaf, *Die Pascha-Feier Israels. BBB* 36 (1970), 136.
67. See Stendebach, 37.
68. According to Laaf, 136: Yahwist.
69. See Stendebach, 37.
70. Scheiber, 97.
71. See Laaf, 136.

tradition[75] and incorporated it into their *šbr* statements, then even — commensurate with their own historical situations — introducing statements referring to God breaking Israel itself (its heart, etc.). Moreover, Isaiah, for example, also incorporates *šbr* into appropriated statements concerning expectations of salvation.[76] The term *šbr* thus becomes a fixed expression in prophetic oracles of judgment (cf. Lam. 1:15 with *šbr* and *slh* piel as a reference to God's judging might).[77]

Commensurate with the ongoing historical situation, these developments of *šbr* statements were probably followed by others as well. References to God breaking someone's arm were placed alongside references to the breaking of war materiel, and the expression concerning God "breaking the yoke" also developed, focusing within the relational nexus God–non-Israelites–Israelites on the relationship between God and Israel. Following statements of judgment and chastisement in which Israel is broken (by God), individual and collective statements of salvation ("healing broken hearts," Ps. 147:3; Isa. 61:1) then developed alongside statements concerning universal salvation (Ps. 46:10[9], the breaking of bows; 76:4[3], arrows; 107:16, bronze doors; Hos. 2:20[18], bows and swords; cf. Isa. 42:3 with 43:17 as a renunciation of war[78]).

VI. Substantives.

1. *šeḇer.* a. *Translation.* The translation of the subst. *šeḇer* depends on the context. In Josh. 7:5 *šeḇer* is independent of the ongoing action, is static, and thus indicates a locale, namely, a "quarry." In Jer. 4:20 it refers to a process rather than a condition and is thus to be translated "in quick/rapid succession" (NRSV "disaster overtakes disaster"). Jer. 50:22 and 51:54 seem to refer to a collapse of the object and the attendant noise. Zeph. 1:10 is thus also translated as "crash."[79] In Job 41:17 the substantive must be construed as a substitute for an adjective and then contextually translated as "trembling (in fear)."[80] Most of the passages, however, suggest the connotation "wound, injury" as a given condition[81] and are thus best served by the resultative translation "collapse." The contextual synonymity of *šeḇer* suggests that it encompasses a broad semantic field already familiar to readers and listeners.[82] That is, the substantive has inherited prior semantic elements of the verb, or, put another way, its own semasiological development never parted company with that of the verb.[83]

b. *Scope.* This dependence of the substantive on the vb. *šbr* emerges in the combinations of *šeḇer* with verbs that frequently accompany the vb. *šbr.* The substantive is frequently used with the verb "heal" *(rāpā')* and "bind (injuries, wounds)" (*ḥāḇaš;* Isa.

75. So Bach, 25.
76. See Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39,* 182-83.
77. Kraus, *Klagelieder,* 32.
78. W. Grimm and K. Dittert, *Deuterojesaja. Calwer Biblischer Kommentar* (1990), 137.
79. Irsigler, 229-30.
80. V. Kubina, *Die Gottesreden im Buche Hiob. FThSt* 115 (1979), 101.
81. See Irsigler, 230.
82. See ibid., 235.
83. See Meyer, 105.

30:26; Jer. 6:14; 8:11; Lam. 2:13). Other substantives can lend to *šeḇer* a military meaning (Isa. 51:19; 59:7; 60:18; Jer. 48:3; 50:22; possibly Isa. 60:18) or that of bodily injury (Prov. 16:18; Isa. 30:13; Jer. 10:19; 14:17; 30:12,15; Nah. 3:19). The subst. *šeḇer* is associated with sinful transgression in the sphere of human behavior or the behavior of faith in Isa. 59:7; 65:14; Jer. 4:6; 6:1.

It is *šeḇer* that almost exclusively expresses the collapse of Israel itself (concerning the dimensions of such collapse, cf. Lam. 4:10, collective, and Lam. 2:11, individual, also Jer. 8:21, *šeḇer* + *šbr* hophal). Individual Israelites are addressed in Lev. 21:19; 24:20, non-Israelites in Job 41:17; Jer. 50:22; 51:54; Ezk. 32:9. Exceptions with other objects of such collapse include Prov. 15:4; 16:18; 17:19; 18:12; Isa. 30:13-14. This tendency to use *šeḇer* in reference to Israel is also confirmed by the genitive expression "collapse/wound (of the daughter) of my/his people" (Isa. 30:26; Jer. 6:14; 8:11,21; Lam. 2:11; 3:48; 4:10). The notion of Israel as a virgin stands behind the expression *baṯ-ʿammî,* thus heightening the drama of collapse.[84] Otherwise *šeḇer* functions only twice as *nomen regens* (Isa. 30:14; Am. 6:6). This conscious use of *šeḇer* can be understood only by way of the prior, fixed use of the verb in that *šbr* connotes the threat of judgment and punishment, *šeḇer* its actual execution[85] and a cautious query concerning the end of punishment (Ps. 60:4[2]; Isa. 60:18; Lam. 2:21).

The two occurrences in Ezk. 21:11(6) and Jer. 17:18 confirm that the reference is to an injury (Ezk. 21:11[6]) and to a demand for judgment (Jer. 17:18).[86]

2. *mašbēr.* Hos. 13:13 associates the *mašbēr,* the "mouth of the womb," with judgment and its accompanying distress, pointing out that God sends judgment as "the pangs of childbirth" in order to bring new life to Israel, and yet Israel refuses.[87] 2 K. 19:3 par. Isa. 37:3 evoke the image of those who are to give birth but lack the strength.[88]

3. *mišbār.* The term *mišbār,* "waves, breakers," is used metaphorically to refer to the threat to a person's existence (esp. 2 S. 22:5). The petitioner in Ps. 42:8(7) and 88:8(7) is either seriously or mortally ill.[89] These passages together with Jon. 2:4(3) view God as a (chastising) initiator of distress. In Ps. 93:4 the metaphor refers to God's power.

VII. 1. *Qumran.* The root *šbr* appears in Qumran only 14 times (in addition to biblical citations). The oldest text of the Community Rule, in what is known as the pre-Qumranite Manifest,[90] circumscribes the humility typical of Qumranite-Essene self-

84. See Kraus, *Klagelieder,* 66.
85. See Meyer, 105.
86. On the possible derivation of the noun *šibbārôn* from *šeḇer,* see *HAL,* IV, 1406.
87. See H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 228.
88. See E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 424.
89. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), in loc.; idem, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), in loc.
90. See C. Dohmen, "Zur Gründung der Gemeinde von Qumran," *RevQ* 11 (1982/84) 81-85.

understanding in 1QS 8:3 with the concept *rwḥ nšbrh,* which occurs alonsgside *yṣr smwk.* 1QS 11:1 then picks up the idea again in a late expansion.[91]

Another 5 occurrences are in 1QH among what are known as the "songs of the teacher" (5:7,37; 6:28; 7:2; 8:33). These thanksgiving songs focus on imagery already familiar from the OT.[92] Similar imagery in laments as well as in expressions of trust suggest the same origin (4Q381 48, 8; 501 1, 3; 509 12 + 13, 3; 11QPsª 24:16).

The 11QT addenda to the Dtn royal laws use *šbr* parallel with *nkh* and *nṣḥ* to portray victory over enemies in evoking the notion of their complete annihilation (58:12).

Finally, a purity commandment in 11QT 50:18 stipulates that unclean utensils made of earthenware shall be broken because once they have become unclean, they remain so forever.

2. *LXX.* The LXX translates the root *šbr* and its derivatives largely with corresponding forms of *syntríbein* (157 times) and *sýntrimma/syntrimmós* (22 times).[93] Otherwise the qal is rendered several times as *agorázein* (9 times) and *príasthai* (5 times), whereas the niphal and piel attest no additional preferences. Only the hiphil is rendered not by *syntríbein* but by *apodidónai* (3 times) and once each by *empolán, emporeúesthai, metadidónai,* and *pōleín.*

Knipping

91. See J. Pouilly, *La règle de la communauté de Qumrân: Son évolution littéraire. CahRB* 17 (1976).
92. → XI, 309.
93. See G. Bertram, "συντρίβω, σύντριμμα," *TDNT,* VII, 919-25.

שָׁבַת *šāḇaṯ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT: 1. Basic Meaning "Cease, Come to an End"; 2. Specialized Meaning "Celebrate." III. LXX. IV. Qumran.

šāḇaṯ. N.-E. A. Andreasen, *The OT Sabbath. SBLDS* 7 (1972); H. Cazelles, "Ex 34,21 trait-t-il du sabbat?" *CBQ* 23 (1961) 223-26 = idem, *Autour de l'Exode* (Paris, 1987), 295-98; E. Haag, *Vom Sabbat zum Sonntag. TTS* 52 (1991); J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes Ex 34,10-26. FRLANT* 114 (1975); B. Halévy, "Towards the Ancient Image of the Sabbath — 'At Plowing Time and at Harvest Time You Shall Rest,'" *BethM* 24 (1978/79) 50-72; R. North, "The Derivation of Sabbath," *Bibl* 36 (1955) 182-201; G. Rinaldi, "*šbt* in Gen. 2:2," *BeO* 24 (1982) 156; G. Robinson, *The Origin and Development of the OT Sabbath. BBET* 21 (1988); idem, "The Idea of Rest in the OT and the Search for the Basic Character of Sabbath," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 32-42; L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33). BZAW* 188 (1990); F. Stolz, "שׁבת *šbt* to cease, rest," *TLOT,* III, 1297-1303; → שׁבת *šabbāṯ.*

I. Etymology. The vb. *šāḇaṯ,* which maintains the same basic meaning "cease, come to an end," in the qal, niphal, and hiphil, developed the specialized meaning "celebrate" in the OT in connection with the observance of the seventh day (Ex. 34:21);[1] the derivative noun *šabbāṯ* was then semantically influenced by this meaning. These findings correspond to the use of the root *šbt* in related Semitic languages. While the root *šbt* has the same basic meaning in Punic as in Hebrew (*šbt* yiphil, "cause to cease"),[2] in Aramaic and Syriac *(šᵉbat),*[3] as well as in Arabic *(sabata),*[4] its meaning of "rest, keep the Sabbath" demonstrates its dependence on the specialized meaning that developed in Hebrew in connection with the seventh day.

II. OT.

1. *Basic Meaning "Cease, Come to an End."* a. *Qal.* In the qal, *šāḇaṯ* occurs 27 times. Ignoring for a moment those passages in which the verb is used in connection with the commandment to observe a day of rest and the institution of the Sabbath, a picture emerges that is as unequivocal as it is revealing. For example, after ending the Flood, God decrees that "seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night shall not cease" (Gen. 8:22). These four conceptual pairs constitute a totality both in and for themselves as well as a group of four in that they describe a natural occurrence as an expression of the existing cosmic order; their mention focuses on the continuation of the creation that has been rescued and preserved from the Flood. God decrees that as long as the form of this world exists, the natural processes that carry the life of creation will never come to an end. On the first day the Israelites eat of the produce of the land of Canaan, the manna familiar to them from the wilderness ceases (Josh. 5:12). The period during which they ate manna appears here as a totality that is now closed off and thus comes to an end. Nehemiah fears that the reconstruction work in Jerusalem will end prematurely if he follows his adversaries' suggestion and goes to meet them (Neh. 6:3). In a song of mockery at the downfall of the king of Babylon, Israel finds to its satisfaction that the end of the oppressor also means the end of the distress suffered by the oppressed (Isa. 14:4). At the announcement of the world judgment, the prophet points out that the end *(šāḇaṯ)* of the gay sound of timbrels also means the end of the noise of the arrogant *(ḥāḏal),* whereupon the condition of relaxed gaiety ceases forever (Isa. 24:8). The prophet's findings are similar upon looking back at a catastrophe after which the highways were deserted, travelers no longer came *(šāḇaṯ),* and normal life in the country came to an end (Isa. 33:8). With respect to the new order of the covenant, a prophet remarks that should the creation order ever become unstable, then Israel's offspring "would cease to be a nation" before God forever (Jer. 31:36). According to Hosea, depraved Israel is like an oven burning out of control whose baker has ceased producing decent baked goods (Hos. 7:4). After the fall of Judah and the destruction of Jerusalem, the people lament that the old men no longer

---

1. See II.2 below.
2. See *DNSI,* II, 1106-7.
3. See *LexSyr,* 750.
4. Wehr, 392-93; on Ethiopic and Tigre see *HAL,* IV, 1407.

come *(šāḇaṯ)* to the gate and that all human joy has ceased (Lam. 5:14-15). One proverb observes that if one drives out the gossip (scoffer?), strife will disappear, and "quarreling and abuse will cease" (Prov. 22:10). Finally, after lengthy discourse even Job's friends cease trying to persuade the unhappy Job (Job 32:1). In the qal the vb. *šāḇaṯ* everywhere describes the cessation of a process that has already gone on for a lengthy period of time; moreover, the reference is not merely to the interruption of the process in question but to its end in the sense of a genuine conclusion.

A similar situation applies in those passages in which the vb. *šāḇaṯ* is used in the qal in connection with the institution of the Sabbath. The Priestly account of creation concludes with the statement that on the seventh day God "finished the work that he had done" and also that on that seventh day he "ceased *(šāḇaṯ)* from all the work that he had done" (Gen. 2:2-3). At God's behest, Moses tells the people that Yahweh has given them the Sabbath and thus also will give them twice the quantity of food on the sixth day so they can remain at home on the seventh; "so the people celebrated *(šāḇaṯ)* on the seventh day" (Ex. 16:30). The account by no means refers to a liturgical celebration or festival assembly, but rather only to the fact that on the seventh day the gathering of the manna, mentioned several times in the preceding verses (vv. 21-22,26), comes to an end. With an explicit reference to the conclusion of God's work of creation, the pentateuchal Sabbath regulations identify the institution of the Sabbath as a sign between Yahweh and Israel forever; for God created heaven and earth in six days and then celebrated on the seventh by ceasing his work *(šāḇaṯ)* and breathing a sigh of relief, like those who look back upon the work they have just finished (Ex. 31:17). Just as Israel does on the Sabbath itself, so also is it to observe a strict day of rest on the great Day of Atonement (Lev. 23:32); the construction of the *figura etymologica* here *(šāḇaṯ šabbāṯ)* shows that this decree is not concerned primarily with resting in the sense of recovering, but rather with the end of that particular process that otherwise normally finds expression in the ending of work on the Sabbath. However, not only the people but the land itself is to enjoy Sabbath rest every seven years (Lev. 25:2); here too the construction of the *figura etymologica (šāḇaṯ šabbāṯ)* suggests that the reference is not just to the resting of the land, but to a process in which every seven years the cultivation of the land comes to a conclusion comparable to the cessation of work on the seventh day. Through God's judgment, however, the land will catch up on its Sabbath rest because of the many transgressions against this commandment; only when these years of rest are finally bequeathed will the land itself be able to celebrate (*šāḇaṯ*, Lev. 26:34-35). After the fall of Judah, this decree concerning the land catching up on Sabbath rest was realized during the exile, since now the land could celebrate *(šāḇaṯ)* until the seventy years of judgment measured out by God had come to an end (2 Ch. 36:21).

b. *Niphal.* The four occurrences of *šāḇaṯ* in the niphal also without exception presuppose the basic meaning already familiar from the qal: "cease, come to an end." According to Isaiah, after judgment both the fortress of Ephraim, namely, the capital Samaria, as well as the kingdom of Damascus will come to an end such that political autonomy will disappear forever for northern Israel and Aram (Isa. 17:3). Ezekiel similarly tells his people that through judgment its towns will be wasted and its cultic places ruined so that in this collapse not only the idols but also those who worship them

will come to an end (Ezk. 6:6). For within God's judgment, the people's proud splendor will disappear not only in Egypt (30:18) but also in Israel itself (33:28). That is, an entire stage in the history of the two peoples will come to an end.

c. *Hiphil.* The vb. *šāḇaṯ* occurs 40 times in the hiphil, where the meaning "cause to cease, eliminate, put an end to" emerges as the causative version of the basic meaning of the verb in the qal. Pharaoh accuses Moses and Aaron of luring the people into doing nothing (Ex. 5:5). In preparation for the Passover, Israel is to remove leaven from their houses (Ex. 12:15). The salt of the covenant with God should not be missing from any grain offering (Lev. 2:13; cf. 11QT 20:13). If Israel follows God's instructions, the law promises that God will grant the land peace and will "remove dangerous animals" from it (Lev. 26:6). By contrast, in an oracle of judgment Moses tells the people that if they are not obedient, God will bring their existence to an end and "blot out the memory of them from humankind" (Dt. 32:26). After the land conquest, the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh erect an altar at the Jordan for Yahweh because they fear that someday someone might — expressed literally — make their children cease to worship the God of Israel (Josh. 22:25). During the Dtn reform, Josiah puts an end to the service of the idolatrous priests whom the kings of Judah had installed in the high places (2 K. 23:5). Josiah deals similarly with the horses set up at the entrance to the temple in honor of the sun (v. 11). By means of skillful politics of alliance, King Asa of Judah manages to prompt his adversary Baasha of Israel to cease work on the fortress of Ramah (2 Ch. 16:5). During the reconstruction of Jerusalem under Nehemiah, Judah's enemies decide to bring the undertaking to an end (Neh. 4:5).

Through judgment, God brings an end to the pride of the arrogant (Isa. 13:11) and to the shouts of the vintners (Isa. 16:10), though also to the sighing of the oppressed (Isa. 21:2). Those in Judah who rebel against Yahweh sound blasphemous when they beg to be left alone concerning the Holy One of Israel (Isa. 30:11). Instead, however, God's judgment will bring to an end the "sound of mirth and gladness" in the cities of Judah and the streets of Jerusalem (Jer. 7:34; 16:9), for the king of Babylon will bring an end to all the people and animals in the land (Jer. 36:29). In Moab, too, all gladness and joy will fall silent because God's judgment brings to an end the wine in the presses (Jer. 48:33). God will also bring to an end sacrifices in the high places of Moab (v. 35). Ezekiel similarly tells Judah that God "will put an end to the arrogance of the strong" (Ezk. 7:24), though he will also put an end to the people's unbelief, which finds expression in the proverb asserting that the prophet's visions will not come to pass (12:23). For God will put a stop to Israel's fornications (16:41; 23:27,48). God similarly silences the music of songs in judgment upon Tyre (26:13) and puts an end to Egypt's splendor (30:10) and to the idols of Memphis (v. 13). God even brings the service of Israel's shepherds to an end (34:10), whereas when the time of salvation comes after that of judgment, he will banish the wild animals from the land (34:25).

According to Hosea, God puts an end to the kingdom of the house of Israel (Hos. 1:4), though also to all Israel's "mirth, her festivals, her new moons, her sabbaths, and all her appointed festivals" (Hos. 2:13[11]). Amos accuses the oppressors within his own people of having brought the poor in the land to ruin (i.e., to an end; Am. 8:4). After Daniel's oracle of seventy weeks, during half of the final week the sacrifices and

offerings in the temple are put to an end (Dnl. 9:27). And the arrogant ruler Antiochus III will be opposed by a commander who will put an end to his campaigns of conquest (Dnl. 11:18). "Out of the mouths of babes and infants" God fashions a bulwark to spite his enemies and bring an end to their show of power (Ps. 8:3[2]), for God "makes wars cease to the end of the earth" (46:10[9]). Indeed, in judgment God even put an end to his own king, hurling his throne to the ground (89:45[44]). God removes all the wicked from the land as dross (119:119). By contrast, the casting of lots puts an end to disputes (Prov. 18:18). God did not, however, leave Ruth without a redeemer (Ruth 4:14).

d. *Summary.* An overview shows that the basic meaning of the verb *šāḇaṯ* in the qal is "cease, come to an end," and that in the niphal this is altered to the passive meaning "be brought to an end, disappear," and in the hiphil to the causative meaning "bring to an end, eliminate, remove (from, out of)." The reference is consistently to the cessation of a previous activity or to the end of a process that has come to a conclusion and that is not merely interrupted temporarily. Even in those passages in which the vb. *šāḇaṯ* in the qal refers to the institution of the Sabbath, the basic meaning "cease, come to an end" is still unmistakable. The reference is to that behavior which constitutes the observance of the Sabbath itself or, in the manner of the Sabbath observance, to the conclusion of a specific process. In no instance does the vb. *šāḇaṯ* as such mean "rest (from work)," and no evidence suggests that the vb. *šāḇaṯ* itself derives from the noun *šabbāṯ*.

2. *Specialized Meaning "Celebrate."* Because the commandment concerning the day of rest in Ex. 34:21 (and 23:12) apparently contrasts the behavior described by the vb. *šāḇaṯ* without an object to the previously mentioned behavior described by *'āḇaḏ* (also without an object), the reference can only be to a cessation or end of the work of the six days as a whole. Hence according to the regulation concerning the day of rest, the institution of the seventh day does not simply involve an interruption of work of the sort already the case regarding one's evening rest or a break or pause. Especially considering the absolute use of the two verbs *'āḇaḏ* and *šāḇaṯ* on the one hand and the contrast of the seventh day indicated by the vb. *šāḇaṯ* over against the previous six workdays on the other, the reference is rather to a conclusion that is to be understood as that through which the totality of a given workload, regardless of its nature, comes to an end.

The additional stipulation to the commandment concerning the day of rest in Ex. 34:21b decrees that the commandment regarding the seventh day is to apply to the time of plowing and harvest. When one considers that plowing and harvest here (as also in Gen. 45:6 and 1 S. 8:12) represent polar concepts and as such serve to circumscribe a totality, it becomes clear that the additional stipulation is neither restricting the commandment to two specific seasons, and certainly not to two festivals associated with such, nor emphatically inculcating the observance of the seventh day for the period of the greatest workload. The conceptual pair "plowing and harvest" functions rather to circumscribe as a totality the entire year as such, and does so specifically within the conceptual horizon of precisely the kind of agrarian culture that was determinative for

Israel in Canaan.[5] What this means, however, is that the commandment regarding the day of rest applied to the entire year, quite independent of the current workload or of the seasonal changes determining that load.

Hence in the commandment of Ex. 34:21, it is difficult to assume the basic meaning "cease, come to an end" for the vb. *šāḇaṯ,* since in the first instance the reference would be to an interruption of work on the seventh day, and in the second even to a conclusion of the work of six days, two possibilities that are disqualified both from the perspective of the structure of the commandment as such as well as from that of its applicable sphere. Nor can the frequently proposed rendering of *šāḇaṯ* here as "rest" be used, since it focuses one-sidedly on the manner of the observance of the seventh day without adequately expressing its intention within the framework of the commandment. The semantically most appropriate rendering of *šāḇaṯ* here seems to be "celebrate," since this meaning circumscribes the observance of that particular remembrance whose content first makes the contrast between the seventh day on the one hand and the preceding totality of six workdays on the other comprehensible, namely, the remembrance, developing out of Passover week, of Israel being successfully brought out of Egypt. At the high point of the temporal unit of the "week," created anew by Israel on the basis of faith in Yahweh's salvific guidance and quite in contrast to the Canaanite religion of Baʿal, this remembrance is regularly to recall that Yahweh alone is able to fulfill all his people's work and, beyond this, also perfect his people's very existence.[6]

III. LXX. The LXX rendering of the vb. *šāḇaṯ* does not exhibit any consistency. It usually translates the verb in the qal and hiphil with *paúein* (Ex. 5:5; 31:17; Dt. 32:26; Neh. 4:5[11]; Prov. 18:18; Isa. 16:10; 24:8; 33:8; Jer. 31:36), in the niphal in part with *apollýnai* (Ezk. 30:18; 33:28), and in the hiphil often with *apostréphein* (Isa. 30:11; Ezk. 7:24; 12:23; 23:27,48; 34:10; Hos. 2:13). It renders the vb. *šāḇaṯ* in the qal in a few instances as *sabbatízein* (Ex. 16:30; Lev. 23:32; 26:34-35; 2 Ch. 36:21; cf. also 1 Esd. 1:55[58]; 2 Mc. 6:6). Hence in its own way the LXX confirms that the basic meaning of the vb. *šāḇaṯ* is in fact "cease, come to an end," and that the specialized meaning "celebrate" as it developed with regard to the commandment concerning the day of rest attained its full form in the observance of the Sabbath.

IV. Qumran. The Qumran texts exhibit the same use of the vb. *šāḇaṯ* as that in the OT tradition, for here too the vb. *šāḇaṯ* is attested in its basic meaning "cease, come to an end" in the qal ("disappear," 11QBer 1:12), niphal ("be at the end," 1QH 8:32), and hiphil ("put an end to," 1QS 10:24; 1QH 1:36; 6:12; 7:15; 9:39; 11:24; 12:14; 18:2,28; 1QH fr. 10:5; CD 11:23; 4QPs^f 9:6; 4QpPs37 4:14; 4Q511 2, I, 3), as well as in its specialized meaning "celebrate" in the qal ("spend the Sabbath"; CD 11:14[corr.]).[7]

E. Haag

---

5. See Halbe, 191.
6. See Haag, 18-23.
7. See Lohse, 88.

שַׁבָּת *šabbāṯ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT: 1. Sabbath and Seventh Day; 2. Preexilic Period; 3. Decalog; 4. Legislation in P; 5. Status in Israel. III. LXX. IV. Qumran.

šabbāṯ. N.-E. A. Andreasen, *The OT Sabbath. SBLDS* 7 (1972); idem, "Recent Studies of the OT Sabbath," *ZAW* 86 (1974) 453-69; idem, *Rest and Redemption. Andrews University Monograph* 11 (Berrien Springs, Mich., 1978); S. Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday* (Rome, 1977); R. Bartelmus, "Mk 2,27 und die ältesten Fassungen des Arbeitsruhegebotes im AT. Biblisch-theologische Beobachtungen zur Sabbatfrage," *BN* 41 (1988) 41-64; J. M. Baumgarten, "The Counting of the Sabbath in Ancient Sources," *VT* 16 (1966) 277-86; Z. Ben Shachar, "The Day After the *šabbāt*," *BethM* 24 (1978/79) 227-28; G. Bettenzoli, "Lessemi ebraici di radici -*ŠBT*-," *Hen* 4 (1982) 129-62; idem, "La tradizione del *Šabbāt*," *Hen* 4 (1982) 265-93; H. Bietenhardt, "Sabbatvorschriften von Qumrān im Lichte des rabbinischen Rechts und der Evangelien," in H. Bardtke, ed., *Qumran-Probleme. DAWB* 42 (1963), 53-74; G. J. Botterweck, "Der Sabbat im AT," *TQ* 134 (1954) 134-47, 448-57; J. Briend, "Sabbat," *DBS*, X, 1132-70; idem, "Le Sabbat en Jr 17,19-27," *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux. FS M. Delcor. AOAT* 215 (1985), 23-35; K. Budde, "The Sabbath and the Week: Their Origin and Their Nature," *JTS* 30 (1928/29) 1-15; W. Eichrodt, "Der Sabbat bei Hesekiel," *Lex tua veritas. FS H. Junker* (Trier, 1961), 65-74; R. Goldenberg, "The Jewish Sabbath in the Roman World up to the Time of Constantine the Great," *ANRW*, II/19.1 (1979), 414-47; P. Grelot, "Du sabbat juif au dimanche chrétien I. Enquête sur le sabbat juif," *La Maison-Dieu* 123 (1975) 79-107; idem, "Du sabbat juif au dimanche chrétien II. Le dimanche chrétien," *La Maison-Dieu* 124 (1975) 14-54; J. Guillén Torralba, "Motivación deuteronómica del precepto del Sabat," *EstBíb* 29 (1970) 73-99; E. Haag, *Vom Sabbat zum Sonntag. TTS* 52 (1991); F. Hahn, "Schabbat und Sonntag," *EvT* 46 (1986) 495-507; J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes Ex 34,10-26. FRLANT* 114 (1975); idem, "Erwägungen zu Ursprung und Wesen des Massotfestes," *ZAW* 87 (1975) 324-45; B. Halévy, "Towards the Ancient Image of the Sabbath — 'At Plowing Time and at Harvest Time You Shall Rest,'" *BethM* 24 (1978/79) 50-72; W. W. Hallo, "New Moons and Sabbaths: A Case-study in the Contrastive Approach," *HUCA* 48 (1977) 1-18; J. Hehn, *Siebenzahl und Sabbat bei den Babyloniern und im AT. LSSt* II/5 (1907); idem, *Der israelitische Sabbat. BZfr* II/12 ([3]1912); idem, "Zur Sabbatfrage," *BZ* 14 (1917) 198-213; S. B. Hoenig, "Sabbatical Years and the Year of Jubilee," *JQR* 59 (1968/69) 222-36; idem, "An Interdict Against Socializing on the Sabbath," *JQR* 62 (1971/72) 77-83; F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. OBO* 45 (1982); idem, "Zum synoptischen Vergleich der Dekalogfassungen," in idem, ed., *Vom Sinai zum Horeb. Stationen alttestamentlicher Glaubensgeschichte* (Würzburg, 1989), 73-117; E. Jenni, *Die theologische Begründung des Sabbatgebotes im AT. ThS* (1956); S. T. Kimbrough, "The Concept of Sabbath at Qumran," *RevQ* 5 (1964/66) 483-502; Y. Knohl, "The Sabbath and the Festivals in the Priestly Code and the Laws of the Holiness School," *Shnaton* 7/8 (1983/84) 109-46; M. Köckert, "Das Gebot des siebten Tages," *Das tiefe Wort erneuen. FS J. Henkys* (Berlin, 1989), 170-86; E. Kutsch, "Der Sabbat — ursprünglich Vollmondtag?" *KlSchr zum AT. BZAW* 168 (1986), 71-77; B. Landsberger, *Der kultische Kalender der Babylonier und Assyrer. LSSt* VI/2 (1915); A. Lemaire, "Le sabbat à l'époque royale Israélite," *RB* 80 (1973) 161-85; C. Levin, *Der Sturz der Königin Atalja. SBS* 105 (1982); E. Lohse, "σάββατον," *TDNT*, VII, 1-35; J. Mateos, "Sabbata, sabbaton, prosabbaton, paraskeyē," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 3 (1990) 19-38; F. Mathys, "Sabbatruhe und Sabbatfest," *TZ* 28/4 (1972) 241-62; J. Meinhold, *Sabbat und Woche im AT* (Göttingen, 1905); idem, "Die Entstehung des Sabbats," *ZAW* 29 (1909) 81-112; idem, *Sabbat und Sonntag*

I. Etymology. Although there does indeed seem to be a link between the vb. *šāḇaṯ* and the subst. *šabbāṯ,* "it is nevertheless disputed whether the substantive is to be derived from the verb, or whether the substantive is primary and the verb is to be regarded as denominative."[1] A case can be made that at a very early period,[2] Israel designated the seventh day, in accordance with its unique quality as a genuine institution of the Yahweh faith, with an equally unique expression, the noun *šabbāṯ,* deriving it from the vb. *šāḇaṯ* used in the ancient Israelite commandment concerning the day of rest (Ex. 34:21) and then developing its content with reference to the specific meaning of that verb. The philological basis is the construction from the vb. *šāḇaṯ,* through gemination of the medial radical, of an intensive noun *šabbāṯ (šbbtt)* whose feminine ending indicates an abstract meaning. The historical process presupposed here is attested by many examples (e.g., *ḥaṭṭā'â* < *ḥaṭṭa'aṯ* and *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* < *ḥaṭṭa'ṯ*[3]). The normally feminine noun *šabbāṯ,* probably under the influence of the following (or understood) *yôm,* appears in later texts as a masculine noun (Ex. 20:8,11; Isa. 56:2; 58:13). The derivation of the

---

(Leipzig, 1909); idem, "Zur Sabbathfrage," *ZAW* 48 (1930) 121-38; J. Milgrom, "'Sabbath' and 'Temple City' in the Temple Scroll," *BASOR* 232 (1978) 25-27; P. D. Miller, "The Human Sabbath: A Study of Deuteronomic Theology," *Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 6 (1985) 81-97; N. Negretti, *Il settimo giorno. AnBibl* 55 (1973); R. North, "The Derivation of Sabbath," *Bibl* 36 (1955) 182-201; A. Pelletier, "Σάββατα. Transcription grecque de l'Araméen," *VT* 22 (1972) 436-77; G. Rinaldi, "*šabbat e šabûa',*" *BeO* 25 (1983) 136; G. Robinson, *The Origin and Development of the OT Sabbath. BBET* 21 (1988); idem, "The Idea of Rest in the OT and the Search for the Basic Character of Sabbath," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 32-42; idem, "The Prohibition of Strange Fire in Ancient Israel," *VT* 28 (1978) 301-17; W. Rordorf, *Sabbat und Sonntag in der Alten Kirche* (Zurich, 1972); J. Scharbert, "Biblischer Sabbat und modernes Wochenende," *Die alttestamentliche Botschaft als Wegweisung. FS H. Reinelt* (Stuttgart, 1990) 285-306; A. Safran, "Le *sabbat* dans la tradition juive," *Revue de théologie et philosophie* 110 (1977) 136-49; B. Sharvit, "The Sabbath of the Judean Desert Sect," *BethM* 21 (1975/76) 507-16; J. S. Siker-Gieseler, "The Theology of the Sabbath in the OT: A Canonical Approach," *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 11 (1981) 5-20; F. Stolz, "שׁבת *šbt* to cease, rest," *TLOT,* III, 1297-1303; idem, "Sabbat, Schöpfungswoche und Herbstfest," *WuD* 11 (1971) 159-75; J. F. Strange, "The History of the Sabbath," *BI* 14/2 (1988) 32-34; J. H. Tigay, "*Lifnê haššabbāṯ* and *'aḥar haššabbāṯ* = 'on the day before the Sabbath' and 'on the day after the Sabbath' (Nehemiah XIII, 19)," *VT* 28 (1978) 362-65; A. Toeg, "Genesis I and the Sabbath," *BethM* 18 (1972/73) 288-96; M. Tsevat, "The Basic Meaning of the Biblical Sabbath," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 447-59; N. H. Tur-Sinai, "Sabbat und Woche," *BiOr* 8 (1951) 14-24; B. Uffenheimer, "*šasbbath-šᵉmiṭṭâh-yôbēl,*" *BethM* 30 (1984/85) 28-40; T. Veijola, "Die Propheten und das Alter des Sabbatgebots," *Prophet und Prophetenbuch. FS O. Kaiser. BZAW* 185 (1989), 246-64; E. Vogt, "Hat 'šabbāt' im AT den Sinn von 'Woche'?" *Bibl* 40 (1959) 1008-11; B. Z. Wacholder, "The Calendar of Sabbath Years During the Second Temple Era: A Response," *HUCA* 54 (1983) 123-33; P. Wells, "Le Sabbat, signe eschatologique," *Révue Réformée* 26 (1975) 137-47; H. W. Wolff, "The Day of Rest in the OT," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 43 (1972) 498-506; J. H. Wright, "What Happened Every Seven Years in Israel?" *Evangelical Quarterly* 56 (1984) 129-38, 193-201; T. Zahavy, "The Sabbath Code of Damascus Document X,14–XI,18: Form, Analytical and Redaction Critical Observations," *RevQ* 10 (1979/81) 589-91; M. Zobel, *Der Sabbat* (Berlin, 1935).

1. *HAL,* IV, 1407.
2. See II.1.
3. *BLe,* §61zβ.

noun *šabbāṯ* from the vb. *šāḇaṯ* presented here explains not only the doubling of the medial radical *b* in the noun *šabbāṯ,* but also that of the *t* in the suffixed forms *šabbattô* and *šabbattāh* (Nu. 28:10; Isa. 66:23; Hos. 2:13[Eng. 11]). The basic meaning of the noun *šabbāṯ* is thus "holiday," "day of celebration," specifically in the sense of the ancient Israelite commandment regarding the day of rest on the decreed seventh day.

The term *šabbāṯôn,* occurring only in the P tradition, confirms this etymology. It occurs in the superlative construction *šabbaṯ šabbāṯôn* in reference to the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:31; 23:32), the Sabbath Year (25:4), and the Sabbath itself (23:3; 31:15; 35:2). The term *šabbāṯôn* appears alone in reference to New Year's Day (23:24), the first and eighth day of the Feast of Booths (23:39), the Sabbath Year (25:5), and finally also the Sabbath itself (16:23). In the superlative construction, *šabbāṯ* does not refer to the Sabbath day, "but rather is an appellative, while the artificial construction שַׁבָּתוֹן represents an intensification with the same meaning."[4] This means, however, that *šabbāṯ* as a genuinely Israelite term has the basic meaning "holiday," and that the construction *šabbāṯôn,* which similarly emerged first in Israel as an intensification of *šabbāṯ,* is to be rendered as "absolute day of rest," "high holiday," or "time for celebration."

The Hebrew noun *šabbāṯ* occurs as a loanword in Aramaic (st. abs. *šabbā',* st. determined or emph. *šabbᵉṯā',* pl. *šabbayyā'*), Syriac (st. abs. *šabbā,* st. emph. *šabbᵉṯā,* pl. *šabbîn*), Arabic *(sabt),* and Ethiopic (sg. *sanbat,* pl. *sanābet* and *sanbatāt*).

The frequently proposed connection between *šabbāṯ* and the Akkadian noun *šab/pattu,* which refers to the fifteenth day of the month, the middle of the lunar month,[5] needs a more detailed assessment. The proposed etymological connection between the Akkadian primary noun *šab/pattu*[6] and the Hebrew root *šbt*[7] can only be adduced with regard to its basic meaning, "cease, come to an end." Any connection between Akk. *šab/pattu* and Heb. *šabbāṯ,* however, is both etymologically and semantically impossible, since the noun *šabbāṯ* derives from the vb. *šāḇaṯ* in the specialized meaning "celebrate,"[8] and because in the OT the noun *šabbāṯ* refers consistently to the weekly day of rest that is independent of the lunar phases and has no reference to the day of the full moon.[9]

II. OT.

1. *Sabbath and Seventh Day.* The equating of the Sabbath and the seventh day in the Decalog (Ex. 20:8-11; Dt. 5:12-15) raises the question whether the origin and meaning of the seventh day might in its own turn illuminate the origin and character of the Sabbath. The point of departure for answering this question is the observation that in the festival calendar of Yahweh's reserved privileges, the ancient Israelite commandment concerning the day of rest exhibits a striking form-critical similarity with the decree concerning the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 34:18,21). It is highly probable that the

---

4. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 313.
5. *AHw,* III, 1172.
6. See *CAD,* XVII, 449-50.
7. *HAL,* IV, 1410a, with reference to Landsberger, 133, 135.
8. See Haag, 42 n. 48.
9. *HAL,* IV, 1410a.

Feast of Unleavened Bread originated through a separation of the meal of unleavened bread from the Passover rite and its subsequent acquisition of independence during the period when Israel settled in Canaan, a process through which the unleavened bread of the Passover — the bread the Israelites ate when embarking upon the exodus and during the wilderness wanderings — became the unleavened bread of remembrance of eating the yield of the land for the first time and thus a sign of the fulfillment of the exodus promise.[10] It was only in the festival calendar of the Dtn reform, a calendar based on the earliest traditions, that the two focal points of the earlier Passover celebration, namely, the slaughtering of the lambs and the eating of unleavened bread, were again united into a single festival observance (Dt. 16:1-8; cf. 2 K. 23:21-23). As far as the manner of the observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread stipulated in the law of Yahweh's privileges is concerned, however, one notices that although the traditional festival date in the month of Abib was indeed maintained, the festival observance itself was extended to seven days. In contrast to the night, which as the length of the Passover festival originated in a nomadic shepherding custom from Israel's earliest period, the seven days reckoned as the length for eating unleavened bread in all likelihood represents the heritage of Canaanite culture, which in this instance, however, functions merely as the mediator for a notion found everywhere in the OT, since all the cultures in the OT environs understand the number seven as a sacred number and as an expression of perfection.[11] The extension of the festival length to seven days during the observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread thus allows the conclusion that here, in the festival content itself, namely, in the remembrance of Israel's exodus from Egypt, the focal point had shifted. Whereas the Passover celebration focused on Yahweh's display of power toward those who opposed his plan and on realizing the exodus out of the power sphere of the oppressor, the seven-day Feast of Unleavened Bread focused on the successful conclusion of Israel's exodus from Egypt. The association with the old Passover date in the month of Abib, however, ensured that the memory of the people's entire previous experience in history with Yahweh's guidance would not be lost.

It is highly probable that in its own turn, the development of the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Canaan as described here generated in Israel the new temporal unit of the week. The evidence for this assertion is the fact already mentioned that in Ex. 34:18 and 21 the ancient Israelite commandment concerning the day of rest exhibits a striking similarity with the decree concerning the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and that in both cases the same tension grounded within salvation history constitutes the background. For both the Passover date and the Feast of Unleavened Bread on the one hand, and the six days of work and the one day of work prohibition on the other, proclaim in their own ways the overcoming of servitude in Egypt, namely, in that Yahweh has fulfilled his promise of land to his people. The introduction of this new temporal unit of the "week" was apparently prompted by the challenge presented to the Yahweh faith by the Baʿal religion in Canaan, which had already prompted further development of

10. See Halbe, *ZAW* 87 (1975) 324-45.
11. → שבע *šeḇaʿ*.

of work also emerges from the fact that this version refers emphatically to the variety attaching to the divine acts of creation as well (heaven, earth, sea; Ex. 20:11). Whereas the Dtn version decrees the "observance" *(šāmar)* of the Sabbath as a form of "keeping" it (*'āśâ,* Dt. 5:12,15), the version in Exodus demands that one "remember" *(zāḵar)* the Sabbath day and keep it holy because God himself consecrated the seventh day of creation, the prototype of the Sabbath (Ex. 20:8,11). Accordingly God himself laid the foundation for the holiday remembrance of the Sabbath whose sacred status is thus no longer observed merely in observing a day of rest from work, which the Dtn version had already made into a confessional sign of faith in Yahweh (Dt. 5:14), but now also by observing cultically the element of holiday remembrance (cf. Lev. 23:1-3).

4. *Legislation in P.* The enormous significance of the Sabbath expressed in the Exodus version of the Sabbath commandment produced a broad echo in the Sabbath legislation of P. Within the history of tradition, the concern was now no longer merely with a sanctification of the Sabbath as the remembrance of God's salvific revelation in creation and history, but also with the relationship between the Sabbath and other institutions in Israel in which the same understanding of faith was at work as in the development of the Sabbath commandment itself.

According to P, the Sabbath is a sign of Israel's sanctification by Yahweh, and its observance represents an obligation for the people of God forever whose neglect will be punished by death (Ex. 31:13-17). Yahweh's sanctification of Israel is also associated with the prohibition against kindling fire (Ex. 35:1-3) and gathering wood (Nu. 15:32-36) on the Sabbath, a prohibition originally directed against cultic practices with fire kindled in worship of foreign gods (Lev. 10:1; Nu. 3:4; 26:61).[17]

According to the Holiness Code (H), which similarly grounds the keeping of the Sabbath in Yahweh's sanctification of Israel (Lev. 19:3-4,30), the Sabbath as one of Israel's "appointed festivals" *(mô'ᵃḏîm)* is thus characterized commensurately with this distinction by the summoning of a holy convocation and the observance of an absolute day of rest (Lev. 23:1-3). The point of departure for calculating the time of the Feast of Weeks in the Holiness Code is an otherwise undefined date at the beginning of the grain harvest, namely, the day after the Sabbath on which the first sheaf is presented (vv. 9-16). That here, unlike in the earlier decree (Dt. 16:9), it is no longer seven weeks but rather seven Sabbaths that come to characterize the harvest festival is shown by the Holiness Code's own unique estimation of the Sabbath, which here has become a synonym for "week."

In connection with regulations for priestly duties, H decrees a perpetual obligation for Aaron to set out the bread of the Presence each Sabbath (Lev. 24:8-9). A later legal text specifies in reference to Israel's Sabbath observance as portrayed in H that the offering is to include two yearling lambs without blemish and an ephah of choice flour mixed with oil and its drink offering (Nu. 28:9-10).

As an analogy to the Sabbath commandment for Israel as the people of God, H also

17. See Robinson, *VT* 28 (1978) 301-17.

attests a regulation for the land of Israel fixing a universal fallow year for the seventh year applicable to both field and vineyard after six years of cultivation (Lev. 25:1-7). As the appropriation of the Dtn formula "Sabbath for Yahweh" (v. 4) betrays, the meaning of this regulation is the acknowledgment of Yahweh as the sole lord of the land whose fullness of blessings Israel has enjoyed since the exodus from Egypt. Independent of the Sabbath year, H then also decrees that after seven Sabbaths of years the fiftieth year is to be observed as a Jubilee Year, whereupon a release is announced according to which every Israelite was permitted to return to his property and to his family; moreover, during the Jubilee Year there was to be no sowing, no reaping of aftergrowth, and no harvesting of unpruned vines. Rather, Israel was to enjoy the yield of the land away from the field (25:8-12). The background to this regulation was probably an institution from the period of Israel's settlement in the land according to which every fifty years the original property relationships were to be reestablished in the land resulting in a corresponding new regulation of real estate claims.[18] The present form of the regulations for the Jubilee Year, however, has been shaped by the Sabbath tradition reflected in the intensification within the account of creation in P. The stipulated "release" *(dᵉrôr)* no longer focuses only on the salvific-historical remembrance of Israel's earlier exodus from Egypt, but also on the reorganization within the land of promise bequeathed to the people after the chastisement of the exile, as clearly expressed by the reckoning of the Jubilee Year with the square of the number seven.

Before moving on to blessing and curse, H inculcates once more the observance of the Sabbath (Lev. 26:2). The portrayal of the threat of curse then alludes to the land of Israel that was abandoned by its inhabitants, the land that during the period of its desolation must "celebrate" *(šāḇaṯ)* and "accept" *(rāṣâ)*[19] like an iniquity the Sabbaths it missed (26:34-35,43). Whereas the background to this punishment decree is the notion of the close, indeed fateful connection between people and the place where they live, a notion applicable to the OT in general, the association of this threat of curse with the Sabbath year unique to H (25:1-7) apparently derives from the fact that the designation of the fallow years God imposes upon the land in judgment as a "celebration" *(šāḇaṯ)* circumscribes an event serving to demonstrate Yahweh's holiness. In its own way, H here is following the prophecy influenced by P (Ezk. 36:16-38) in emphasizing the positive aspect of divine punishment.

5. *Status in Israel.* In the final form of the Sabbath commandment in the Decalog and in the Sabbath legislation in P, the development of the relevant tradition of faith reached its culmination within the OT and at the same time established a norm of faith which during the subsequent period left a lasting impression on the confession to Yahweh. A whole series of prophetic passages in Trito-Isaiah (Isa. 56:2,6; 58:13; 66:23) and in the redactional strata of Jeremiah (Jer. 17:21-22,24,27) and Ezekiel (Ezk. 20:12-13,16,20-21,24; 22:8,26; 23:38; 44:24; 45:17; 46:1,3-4,12) emphasizes the es-

---

18. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 351-54.

19. See G. Gerleman, "רצה *rṣh* to be pleased with," *TLOT,* III, 1259-61.

in an anticipatory fashion the worship participants, who are celebrating the Sabbath away from Jerusalem, into the heavenly sanctuary.[22] 11QPs[a] 27:7 ascribes to David the authorship of 52 (!) songs for the *qorbān* of the Sabbaths. According to the Habakkuk *pesher*, the iniquity of the Wicked Priest was viewed as a scandal; in pursuing the Teacher of Righteousness to the latter's place of exile, the Wicked Priest appeared there at the festival time, on the Day of Atonement, to confuse the Teacher's followers, indeed doing so on the Day of Fasting, the Sabbath of repose (1QpHab 11:8). By contrast, the War Scroll (which in one of the oldest mss. still mentions the *ḥṣwṣrwt hšbtwt*, "trumpets of the Sabbaths" [4QM[c] 13]), anticipates that during the time of the final struggle of the sons of light against the sons of darkness, during the year of release daily services are to be performed in the sanctuary (1QM 2:4) and that no one is to go to war, since the Year of Release is a sabbath of rest for Israel (2:8). Everywhere the understanding of the Sabbath observance here exhibits its roots in the Torah and its OT interpretive tradition (cf. esp. the reception and continuation of OT texts in 1Q22 1:8; 3:1; 11QT 13:17; 18:11-12; 19:12-13; 21:13; 25:3,9; 27:6,8; 43:2), though the casuistry here exhibits an unmistakable tendency toward intensification (cf. CD).

E. Haag

---

22. See C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. HSS* 27 (1985), 17.

שָׁגָה/שָׁגַג *šāḡâ/šāḡag*; שְׁגָגָה *šᵉḡāḡâ*; שְׁגִיאָה *šᵉḡî'â*; מִשְׁגֶּה *mišgeh*; מְשׁוּגָה *mᵉšûḡâ*

Contents: I. Etymology and Word Classes: 1. Survey of Verbal and Nominal Derivatives; 2. Semitic Parallels; 3. Verbal Syntax and Verb Classes. II. Occurrences and Assessment: 1. Verbs; 2. Substantives. III. LXX. IV. Qumran.

šāḡâ. R. Bultmann, "ἀγνοέω, ἀγνόημα," *TDNT*, I, 115-21; H. Gese, "Die Sühne," *Zur biblischen Theologie. BEvT* 78 (1977), 85-106; F. Gössmann, "Der *šiggāyôn*," *Aug* 8 (1968) 361-81; B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982); D. Kellermann, "Bemerkungen zum Sündopfergesetz in Num 15,22ff.," *Wort und Geschichte. FS K. Elliger. AOAT* 18 (1973), 107-13; N. Kiuchi, *The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature: Its Meaning and Function. JSOTSup* 56 (1987); R. Knierim, "שׁגג *šgg* to err," *TLOT*, III, 1302-4; J. Milgrom, "The Cultic *šggh* and Its Influence in Psalms and Job," *JQR* 58 (1967) 115-25 = *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology. SJLA* 36 (1983), 122-32; idem, *Cult and Conscience. The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance. SJLA* 18 (1976); J. Pouilly, "L'évolution de la législation pénale dans la communauté de Qumrân," *RB* 82 (1975) 522-51; G. Quell, "ἁμαρτάνω," *TDNT*, I, 267-86; Rolf Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967); M.-J. Seux, *"šiggayôn = šigû?" De la Tôrah au Messie. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 419-38.

I. Etymology and Word Classes.

1. *Survey of Verbal and Nominal Derivatives.* The root morpheme **šg-* is realized in Biblical Hebrew with the aid of the root augments *-y*, lengthened or reduplicated *-g*, *-w*, and *-ʾ*.[1] Only in the first two cases do verbal lexemes occur: *šgh* (17 times in the qal, 4 in the hiphil [one occurrence each in Sirach]) and *šgg* (5 times in the qal, including Gen. 6:3). Derivative substantives include *mišgeh* (only Gen. 43:12) and *šᵉḡāḡâ*,[2] altogether 19 occurrences. The verbs **šûḡ* or **šgʾ* can be deduced only from the substs. *mᵉšûḡâ* (Job 19:4) and *šᵉḡîʾôṯ* (Ps. 19:13[Eng. 12]).[3]

Although the genre designation *šiggāyôn* (Ps. 7:1[S]; Hab. 3:1) is occasionally classified with these roots, its etymology is still not clarified.[4] Proposed derivations include Arab. *šajā*, "cause to worry," *šajīy*, "moving, touching," *sajaʿa*, "speak in rhymed prose"; also Akk. *šegû* II, "be wild, rage" (from *šgʾ*; cf. Heb. *mᵉšuggāʿ*), and *šegû* III = *šigû*, "cry of lament."[5] The etymology of the second element in the name *ʾᵃḇîšaḡ* is similarly not clarified.[6] The realization of **šg-* both in III-*yod/waw* and mediate geminate verb classes with the same meaning, albeit also with restricted use, is common,[7] with parallels, e.g., in *zkh-zkk, khl-kll, qlh-qll* (cf. *qᵉlālâ*), *rbh-rbb*.[8]

2. *Semitic Parallels.* Parallel witnesses in the Semitic languages are restricted to Aramaic and Ethiopic. In Aramaic/Syriac the equivalent basis *šgʾ* appears consistently, both in Imperial Aramaic (cf. *wʾl thšgʾ lbb*[9]) and Jewish Aramaic (*šgʾ* peal and aphel; but also the subst. *šggh* and *šggtʾ*[10]). For Syriac, Zorell adduces additional witnesses that he claims as possible expansions of the root **šg-*, probably because of the related semitic classes: *šᵉgam*, "deceive"; *šᵉgap*, "conceal"; *šᵉgaš*, "confuse"; also Akk. *šegû* II, "be wild, rage."[11] For Ethiopic, reference has long been made to the equivalence

---

1. See W. Richter, *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik I. ATS* 8 (1978), 53.

2. See *BLe*, §61u.

3. See E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*, II (Leipzig, 1865), §99.2.

4. See Seux, *"šiggayôn = šigû?"* 438. Cf. *GesB*, 807; *BDB*, 992-93; a different view is taken by *KBL²*, 948; *HAL*, IV, 1414; cf. also J. Blau, "Philological Notes on the Bible Based on Medieval Judaeo-Arabic," *Shnaton* 3 (1978/79) 199, XXI.

5. On Arab. *šajā* see Wehr, 456. On *šajīy* see ibid.; cf. Gössmann, 366-67. On *sajaʿa* see Wehr, 398. On Akk. *šegû* II see *AHw*, III, 1208. On *šegû* III see ibid., 1208, 1231; cf. G. Rinaldi, "Alcuni termini ebraici relativi alla letteratura," *Bibl* 40 (1959) 285; Gössmann, 365-66; and Seux, *"šiggayôn = šigû?"* 419-21, who question this derivation.

6. See *IPN*, 234; contra the derivation from *šgg* in *BDB*, 992-93, cf. *VG*, I, 402; *HAL*, I, 6.

7. See J. Kuryłowicz, *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics* (Wrocław, 1972), 8ff.; Milgrom, *JQR* 58 (1967) 116. On restricted use see II.1 below.

8. For a summary of similar cases see *GK*, §77e; and esp. G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, II (1929; repr. Darmstadt, 1985), §31c, who already warns against one-sided secondary assessments or mutual derivations; hence the designation "secondary form" is inappropriate for the less frequently attested derivatives of the root **šg-* (contra *GesB* and *KBL²*).

9. Ahiqar 137 (*AP* 217, 242); *DNSI*, II, 1108.

10. See *ANH*, 415; on Syriac see *LexSyr*, 754-55 (*šgʾ* peal, aphel; *šgyʾ, šgwtʾ, mšgynʾ*).

11. *LexHebAram*, 821. On the Syriac witnesses: *LexSyr*, 755, 756, 757; on Akkadian see also the etymology of *šiggāyôn* discussed under 1 above.

with Eth. *sakʷaya, sākʷaya,* "wander around aimlessly," though this reference has phonetic problems.[12]

3. *Verbal Syntax and Verb Classes.* In most of its occurrences, *šgh* qal is primarily a "verb of forward motion,"[13] as made clear in Isa. 28:7a,b, where it appears parallel with the synonym *tʿh,* "stagger"; here *šgh* refers to the uncontrolled movement of a human subject resulting from intoxicating drink; the cause of the intoxicating stagger is indicated by a causative circumstantial, *beyayin šāgû — ûḇaššēḵār tāʿû* (similarly also Prov. 5:19,20; 20:1). The assumed verb class "forward movement" is clearly indicated where locatives *(be, ʿal)* or separatives *(min)* obligatorily accompany the predicate *šgh,* as is the case in Ezk. 34:6, where in a comparison Israel as a herd of small livestock *(ṣōʾn)* "wander" over mountains *(be),* high hills *(ʿal),* and the face of the earth (par. *pwṣ* niphal *ʿal*). In Ps. 119:21,118; Prov. 19:27, *šgh* is used with the separative *min,* though these passages everywhere already attest metaphorical usage ("stray, wander away" in the moral sense), since abstract substantives are used with the separative *(ʾimrê dāʿaṯ, miṣwôṯ [yhwh], ḥuqqê [yhwh]).*

The so-called absolute use of *šgh* qal occurs completely at the metaphorical level, where apart from the individual or collective human subject no obligatory syntagmas appear on the text's surface (the exception being Job 6:24 with *mâ* as the object); causative circumstantials can appear in a facultative function, as is the case in Prov. 5:23 and Sir. 34:5, leading to the meaning "err, transgress, sin," as a general connotation. At this level, *šgh* has made the transition to the class of "affective verbs," possibly "verbs of faring." Relevant witnesses include parallel predicates, as in 1 S. 26:21 (*skl* hiphil); Nu. 15:22 *(lōʾ ʿāśâ);* Job 19:4 *(lîn mešûgāṯî); šgh* is also used absolutely in Job 6:24; Ezk. 45:20; Sir. 34:5. In Lev. 4:13; Nu. 15:22; Job 6:24(?); 19:4; Ezk. 45:20, *šgh* takes on the specialized cultic meaning "unconsciously do wrong, transgress," which the generalized example in Lev. 4:2 defines explicitly as *ḥāṭāʾ ḇišgāgâ.* The use of *šgh* hiphil confirms these findings concerning verbal syntax. Dt. 27:18 and Prov. 28:10 attest the literal use as a verb of forward movement with locatives and directives: *mašgeh beḏereḵ;* Ps. 119:10 attests the figurative use with a separative: *ʾal-tašgēnî mimmiṣwōṯeyḵā;* Job 12:16 and Sir. 8:2 similarly attest the absolute use within the context of wisdom metaphor.

In the qal, *šāgag* is in 5 instances (3 in participial form) used both absolutely with the general meaning "sin, transgress" (Gen. 6:3[?]; Job 12:16; Ps. 119:67) as well as in paronomasia with *šegāgâ* (Lev. 5:18; Nu. 15:28), in which case it, like *šgh,* acquires the specialized cultic meaning, "sin inadvertently." The primary connotation of forward movement does disappear with *šgg,* the meaning remaining at the metaphorical level as "transgress knowingly or unknowingly."

---

12. *LexLingAeth,* 383-84; W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 498; *VG,* I, 122-23; S. Moscati, *An Intro. to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. PLO* 6 (1964), 44.

13. So already Milgrom, *JQR* 58 (1967) 118; on the terminology see W. Richter, *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik III. ATS* 13 (1980), 97-98.

Apart from Job 12:16 (see above), *šgg* qal also occurs within the relevant *šᵉgāgâ* regulations of Lev. 5:18 and Nu. 15:28, and in the confession of Ps. 119:67, which juxtaposes former *šgg* with *šmr 'imraṯ (yhwh).*

Gen. 6:3 poses problems for interpretation. The grapheme compound *bᵉšaggam* can be understood as a suffixed infinitive of *šgg: bᵉšaggām.*[20] It functions as a moral justification of Yahweh's preceding announcement of punishment. Nonetheless, the use of an infinitive with the nominal clause *hû' ḇāśār* seems syntactically difficult.[21] Hence the assumption of an admittedly unusual particle combination *bᵉša + gam* (so also LXX) acquires more syntactical plausibility unless one follows J. Wellhausen in postulating textual corruption, though even he suspects that a "causal particle" is behind *bšgm.*[22]

2. *Substantives.* Because of its frequency and specialized meaning, the subst. *šᵉgāgâ* has attracted the most attention. It is used almost exclusively (Eccl. 10:5?) as a specialized term of cultic law to refer to an "unintentional and thus atoneable sin."[23] Its use is restricted to P (Lev. 4; 5; Nu. 15; 35; dependent on P: Josh. 13; 20; Eccl. 5). Within prepositional phrases using *bᵉ/lᵉ* + *šᵉgāgâ,* with the verbs *ḥāṭā'* (Lev. 4:2,27; 5:15; Nu. 15:27), *'śh* qal (Lev. 4:22; Nu. 15:29), *'śh* niphal (Nu. 15:24), *šgg* (Lev. 5:18 [without *bᵉ*]; Nu. 15:28) it became a formulaic phrase referring to the special case of an unknowing transgression against the law and stipulating the necessary cultic measures (presentation of a *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* offering). Just which concrete actions are meant is not said. Only Lev. 22:14; Nu. 35:11; and Josh. 20:3,9 mention individual transgressions *bišgāgâ,* including eating sacred donations *('kl qdš)* and negligent homicide (*rṣḥ, nkh* hiphil). Nu. 15:25 stipulates sacrificial offerings *(hby' 't qrbn)* after unintentional transgression of the law *('al šᵉgāgâ),* with v. 26 articulating with a noun clause how the entire people are involved in *šᵉgāgâ.* Nu. 15:25 and Eccl. 5:5(6) similarly use noun clauses to categorize instances of unintentional sin *(kî šᵉgāgâ hî').*

Lev. 4 represents the basic reference text for the cultic regulation of *šᵉgāgâ* transgressions. In four paragraphs the final version of the text[24] regulates how otherwise unspecified cases of *šᵉgāgâ* might be cultically atoned if committed by priests (vv. 2-12), the entire community (vv. 13-21), a *nāśî'* (vv. 22-26), and "anyone of the ordinary people" (vv. 27-35), namely, by the presentation of a sin offering *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ)* whose extent was determined by the rank of the transgressor. Lev. 4:26 and 35 formulaically describe the effects of the sin offering as *wᵉḵipper 'ālāyw . . . wᵉnislaḥ lô* (atonement and forgiveness). Nu. 15:22-31, which is probably dependent on Lev. 4 (argumentation in Kellermann), attests the same understanding of *šᵉgāgâ,* now in connection with trans-

---

20. See *GK,* §67p; *BDB,* 992-93.

21. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. trans. 1984), 375-76, argues against a causal infinitive.

22. J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuch und der historischen Bücher des AT* (Berlin, ⁴1963), 308-9.

23. Rendtorff, 203.

24. On its literary genesis see Elliger, *Leviticus,* 53-68.

gressions on the part of the entire community (vv. 22-26), an individual (vv. 27-28), and the alien (vv. 26,29), and now includes *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ,* though also *'ôlâ* (v. 24) and *'iššeh* (v. 25) as part of the requisites for atonement and forgiveness (vv. 26,28). A third paragraph (vv. 30-31) introduces the important contrast to *'āśâ bišgāgâ,* namely, *'āśâ bᵉyāḏ rāmâ,* conscious, intentional (wicked) actions[25] for which the instruments of atonement no longer suffice; instead the text evokes the "formula of cutting off," *wᵉnikrᵉṯâ hannepeš hahî' miqqereḇ 'ammâ,* as a negative counterpart to *wᵉkipper wᵉnislaḥ.*[26] These texts thereby specify with semantic precision *šᵉgāgâ* as a reference to unintentional violations of the law. This *šᵉgāgâ* of cultic law is explicated further by synonymous circumscriptions such as *lō'-yāḏa'* (Lev. 5:17-18), *biḇlî-ḏā'aṯ* (Josh. 20:3,5), *ne'lam (dāḇār) min* (Lev. 4:13; 5:2-4).[27] Yet another understanding underlies the *šᵉgāgâ* cases in Lev. 5:14-19, signaled here by the introductory *tim'ōl ma'al* in the general case (v. 15), which can hardly refer to a "simple case of unintentional transgression," rather referring to a "violation of duty."[28] This parallelism lends to *šᵉgāgâ* the expanded connotation of "negligent, irresponsible omission," which while remaining a sin of error nonetheless does not exclude a certain element of intentionality. Elliger compares these cases with those in 5:1,4, even though they are not designated as *šᵉgāgâ.*[29]

The special nature of the case in Lev. 5:14-19 is also discernible in the varied sacrificial form of the *'āšām,*[30] a "penitential offering"[31] encompassing both restitution and a surcharge (v. 16). The determination of the atonement means within the *'āšām* was probably prompted by the sacral nature of the transgression (*ḥāṭᵉ'â miqqoḏšê yhwh,* v. 15). Such an assessment is made concrete in 22:13-14: *'āḵal qōḏeš bišgāgâ,* albeit without the atonement stipulation of the *'āšām* and only with restitution and surcharge commensurate with 5:16.

The extent to which one can extend the semantic field of *šᵉgāgâ* in the later strata of P is shown by the decree concerning cities of refuge in Nu. 35:9-15, where *šᵉgāgâ* can even refer to "negligent homicide" (vv. 11,15: *makkēh-nepeš bišgāgâ*), a mitigating circumstance allowing for recourse to the right of asylum as protection against blood revenge. The appended law in vv. 16ff. then explicates the parameters of this *šᵉgāgâ* and the transition to murder. Josh. 20:3 and 9, the regulation of cities of refuge, pick up these definitions of Nu. 35 again. Hence in P the term *šᵉgāgâ* acquires a rather broad semantic range that can probably not be restricted to a single meaning, something quite commensurate with the variable use of the verbs *šgh/šgg,* which can refer both to sinful acts in the general sense and to unintentional errors as specified in cultic law. This view provides an additional argument against Milgrom's attempt, which itself has been vari-

---

25. See the discussion in Kellermann, 111-12.
26. See Janowski, 254-55.
27. See Knierim, 1303.
28. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 76.
29. Ibid.; correctly: Kiuchi, 27-28.
30. See in this regard Milgrom, *Cult and Conscience,* 13-83.
31. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 76.

ḥṭ't h'm). Synonyms for sin and seduction generally include combinations with the subst. *mšgh.* In CD 3:4-5 *mšgwtm* refers to the errors of the sons of Jacob (par. *t'w), bmšgt '[wn]mh* in 4QFlor 1:9 and *bmšgtm* in 1QH 2:19 to the intrigues of the sons of Belial against the sons of light. In 4Q184 1:9 *mšgwt 'wl* qualifies the seductive arts of the harlot *(zwnh),* which this fragment also describes verbally (l. 14, *wtšyghw;* l. 17, *lhšgwt*).

The fragmentary witnesses of *šgg* in 4Q508 6:1, *mšgh* in 4Q512 29-32, VII, 3, and *'al šgg* in 1Q27 6, 2 cannot be classified in any word or semantic class.

Seidl

שגע *šg';* שִׁגָּעוֹן *šiggā'ôn*

Contents: I. 1. Linguistic Considerations; 2. Occurrences. II. 1. General Use; 2. As a Description of Prophets. III. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. 1. *Linguistic Considerations.* The forms *šg'/šiggā'ôn* refer to various objective or subjective mental disturbances that cannot be more closely identified in the sense of modern psychology, which is why the suggested meanings "crazy, raging; rage, madness" must be used with caution.[1]

Nor do parallels from Israel's surroundings contribute much to defining these conditions more closely. Although Akk. *šegû* (I and II) is attested, it appears more in connection with animals.[2] Analogous forms are documented in Ethiopic.[3] The identity of roots suggests that Arab. *saja'a,* "coo (dove)," is related to Heb. *šg'.*[4] For describing mental incapacity or weakness of various sorts, Arabic does, however, have at its disposal constructions from the root *sḫf.*

2. *Occurrences.* The sparse occurrences of *šg',* which is used only in the substantival forms and by way of Yiddish has even found its way into English as "meshuga," are spread over the OT and extend from the 10th century B.C.E. into the postexilic period. The pual participle occurs in Dt. 28:34; 1 S. 21:16(Eng. 15); 2 K. 9:11; Jer. 29:26; Hos. 9:7. The hithpael of *šg'* appears in 1 S. 21:15,16(14,15) (inf.). The derivative noun occurs in Dt. 28:28; 2 K. 9:20; Zech. 12:4.

II. 1. *General Use.* The exclusive use of reflexive and passive forms already suggests that *šg'* refers not to active, independent action, but focuses rather on external in-

1. See *GesB,* 807; *KBL*², 949; *HAL,* IV, 1415b. On the substantival construction, see *GK,* §86f.
2. *AHw,* III, 1208.
3. *LexLingAeth,* 1055.
4. Wehr, 398; *VG,* I, 169.

fluence.[5] Mental confusion and madness were viewed as being caused by the numinous,[6] which is why such persons were treated with caution (cf., e.g., Saul in 1 S. 16:14-23). First of all, *šg'* refers to the condition of being "beside oneself," to the incapacity to control one's actions. One example is the episode of David's flight to Achish in 1 S. 21:11-16(10-15). This scene disrupts the structure of the story of David's rise and in part contradicts it (cf. esp. 27:1ff.), yet does date to the 10th century.[7] To avoid the potential danger, David pretends to be a *m^e^šuggā'*, acting oddly,[8] beating uncontrollably on the doors of the city gate (*tpp*, emended text), and letting his spittle run down his beard. Verse 14aα(13aα) emphasizes that in this case the mental disturbance is merely feigned. Achish interprets the behavior as *mištaggēa'* (v. 15[14]). When he similarly refers to his own people as "madmen," the scene acquires the character of a witticism.[9] It is precisely the concluding question in v. 16(15) that makes an exact assessment of the section difficult, since it targets not only David but also the Philistines. Perhaps, as is often the case with political witticisms, the authors intended it as such.

The noun *šiggā'ôn* describes unusual behavior in 2 K. 9:20. Prompted by circumstances, Jehu drives his chariot so fast that an observer describes it as the behavior of someone under the influence of *šiggā'ôn*, "for he drives like a maniac" (concerning this phenomenon, cf. also 1 K. 18:46). Two passages directly identify Yahweh as the initiator of *šg'/šiggā'ôn*. Within the Dtr strata of Dt. 28, the Israelites are threatened with various punishments if they turn away from Yahweh (v. 15), among which v. 28 mentions *šiggā'ôn* alongside blindness *('iwwārôn)*[10] and "confusion of mind" *(timhôn lēḇāḇ)*. The repetition of the curses in vv. 34-42 is directly related to the event of the exile and refers to going mad *(m^e^šuggā')* as a *consequence* of the threatened punishments. Zech. 12:4 picks up Dt. 28:28. The background to this salvific oracle for Jerusalem is the tradition of the assault of the nations against Zion, an event that these verses turn in a positive direction. Yahweh will confuse the advancing enemies, a motif also found in connection with the Yahweh war.[11] The enemies' horses will be struck with *timmāhôn*, their riders with *šiggā'ôn* (v. 4a), making further actions against Jerusalem impossible. The trio from Dt. 28 is completed only by v. 4b, whose reference to Judah and the repetition of *kōl sûs* suggest is secondary.[12] In all these passages *šg'* describes extraordinary, negatively qualified behavior, and those so described are treated contemptuously by those around them. During the later period, mental confusion was understood to be one of Yahweh's punishments, albeit sometimes as the means to an end.

---

5. See A. Jepsen, *Nabi* (Munich, 1934), 11.
6. See in this regard also W. Westendorf, *LexÄg*, II, 517-18; R. Labat, *RLA*, III, 196-97.
7. See F. Crüsemann, "Zwei alttestamentliche Witze," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 215-27.
8. → הלל *hll*, §III.
9. Crüsemann, 222.
10. On this combination see also W. Westendorf, *LexÄg*, II, 517.
11. → המם *hmm*.
12. See M. Sæbø, *Sacharja 9–14. WMANT* 34 (1969), 268-71.

2. *Qumran.* Two occurrences of this term have thus far been attested in Qumran. CD 15:15 mentions the *'ᵉwîl* and the *mᵉšuggāʿ* as well as the *peṯî* and the *mᵉšuggāʿ* (cf. Hos. 9:7) alongside one another. 4QDibHam[a] 1-2, II, 14 addresses Yahweh as he who heals *šiggāʿôn, ʿiwwārôn,* and *timmāhôn.* These three terms seem to have developed into a fixed expression (cf. Dt. 28:28; Zech. 12:4).

Mommer

שַׁד *šaḏ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Archaeological Witnesses and Comparisons from Religious History. III. The Breast as Maternal Organ of Nourishment. IV. The Bust and Eroticism. V. The Breast as Metaphor in Connection with God and His Actions. VI. *'ēl šadday.* VII. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The word *šaḏ* represents a common Semitic noun generally assumed to be a primary noun, possibly originally a children's babbling word.[1] A con-

---

šaḏ. W. F. Albright, "The Names *Shaddai* and *Abram,*" *JBL* 54 (1935) 174-204, esp. 180-93; T. E. S. Arluck, "The Supreme Breasted One (El Shaddai)," *Religion and Intellectual Life* 3/2 (1986) 78-79; H. G. Buchholz and V. Karageorghis, *Altägäis und Altkypros* (Tübingen, 1970); A. Eggebrecht, ed., *Suche nach Unsterblichkeit. Totenkult und Jenseitsglaube im Alten Ägypten* (Hildesheim, 1990); W. Fauth and M.-B. von Stritzky, "Hierodulie," *RAC,* XV, 73-82; D. N. Freedman, "The Divine Name EL SHADDAI, 'He Who Created Families,'" *Dor le Dor* 9 (1980/81) 72-78; M. I. Gruber, "Hebrew *Qĕdēšāh* and Her Canaanite and Akkadian Cognates," *UF* 18 (1986) 133-48; T. A. Holland, "A Study of Palestinian Iron Age Baked Figurines, with Special Reference to Jerusalem: Cave 1," *Levant* 9 (1979) 120-55; U. Hübner, "Das Fragment einer Tonfigurine vom *Tell el-Milḥ.* Überlegungen zur Funktion der sog. Pfeilerfigurinen in der israelitischen Volksreligion," *ZDPV* 105 (1989) 47-55; O. Keel, *Deine Blicke sind Tauben. Zur Metaphorik des Hohen Liedes. SBS* 114/115 (1984); K. M. Kenyon, *Jerusalem: Excavating 3000 Years of History* (London, 1967), esp. 101-3; M. Klein, *The Psychoanalysis of Children* (Eng. trans., New York, [2]1975), 123-48; J. Leipoldt and W. Grundmann, *Umwelt des Urchristentums, III. Bilder zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (Berlin, [6]1987); E. Neumann, *The Great Mother* (Eng. trans., New York, 1955); I. Olbricht, *Verborgene Quellen der Weiblichkeit. Die Brus — das enteignete Organ* (Stuttgart, 1985); A. Passoni Dell'Acqua, "*'El Šaddaj:* Un nomo divino ancora misterioso," *BeO* 22 (1980) 31-54; J. B. Pritchard, *Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known Through Literature. AOS* 24 (1943); A. G. Shedid and M. Seidel, *The Tomb of Nakht: The Art and History of an Eighteenth Dynasty Official's Tomb at Western Thebes* (Eng. trans., Mainz, 1996); E. Stern, *Material Culture of the Land of the Bible in the Persian Period 538–332 B.C.* (Warminster, 1982); J. G. Westenholz, "Tamar, *Qĕdēšša, Qadištu,* and Sacred Prostitution in Mesopotamia," *HTR* 82 (1989) 245-65; U. Winter, *Frau und Göttin. Exegetische und ikonographische Studien zum weiblichen Gottesbild im Alten Israel und in dessen Umwelt. OBO* 53 (1983); W. Wolf, *The Origins of Western Art: Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Aegean* (Eng. trans., New York, 1971).

1. Those following the lead of T. Nöldeke, *NBSS,* 121-22, include, e.g., *GesB,* 808; *HAL,* IV, 1416.

v. 32, which is another version of Isa. 16:9, Isaiah's "battle shout" *(hêḏāḏ)* is replaced by *šōḏēd.*

The oracles against foreign nations offer further examples of *šdd* in connection with military devastation. In Jer. 47:4 (*lišḏôḏ, šōḏēḏ;* concerning the wordplay with "Ashdod," cf. vv. 5,7) the Philistines are destroyed by an army from the north; in 49:3 (pual) Ammon is taken; in 49:10 (pual) Edom is attacked by the nations; and in 49:28 (qal) Kedar is destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. According to 51:48 Babylon is attacked by destroyers from the north, a statement repeated almost verbatim in v. 53, albeit with the expression *mē'ittî* emphasizing that it is Yahweh himself who destroys Babylon. The destroyer triumphs over Babylon's warriors (v. 56), and an army prepared by Yahweh will carry out the destruction (vv. 27-28,58).

Hence Jeremiah uses *šdd* primarily in reference to the destruction brought about by an invading enemy and less in reference to other kinds of destruction.

3. *Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets.* Ezekiel uses *šdd* only in 32:12, an oracle against Pharaoh: "I will cause your hordes to fall by the swords of mighty ones, all of them most terrible among the nations. They shall bring to ruin *(šdd)* the pride of Egypt, and all its hordes shall perish (*šmd* niphal)."

Although Hos. 10:2 focuses on destruction, it does not mention any military activity: "He [apparently Yahweh] will break down *('rp)* their altars, and destroy (*šdd* poel) their pillars." By contrast, v. 13 reprimands Ephraim because it trusted in military power; Yahweh counters in v. 14 with the words, "Therefore the tumult of war shall rise against your people, and all your fortresses shall be destroyed (*šdd* hophal), as Shalman destroyed (*šdd* qal) Beth-arbel on the day of battle when mothers were dashed in pieces with their children (*rṭš* pual)."[7] Hence the military connotations of *šdd* are fully developed in Hosea.

By contrast, Joel 1:10 envisions a completely different kind of invasion. Locusts have attacked the land such that the fields and grain are now devastated (*šdd* pual). Joel 2:1-11 describes these locusts as an advancing army and associates them with the day of Yahweh, which is elsewhere characterized by *šdd* as well (see below). Joel 1:15 even cites Isa. 13:6: "[That day] comes as *šōḏ* from *šadday.*"

Although Ob. 5 stands in a military context, it associates *šôḏᵉḏê laylâ* with thieves. The verse is a variation of Jer. 49:9, though the latter does not use the term *šōḏēḏ.* Here we encounter *šdd* for the first time with the meaning "plunder."

Although Mic. 2:4 is a difficult verse, it is clear that the people are lamenting: "We are utterly ruined *(šāḏôḏ nᵉšaddunû).*" This destruction seems to be of an economic nature and includes the loss of (illegally obtained) land and property (cf. Jer. 9:18[19]).

Nah. 3:7 refers explicitly to the destruction of Nineveh: "Nineveh is devastated *(šoddᵉḏâ);* who will bemoan her?" Whereas the usual sequence is "wail, for X is de-

---

7. On translation considerations see F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, *Hosea. AB* 24 (1980), 560-61.

stroyed" (Isa. 23:1,14; Jer. 48:20; Zech. 11:2), no one cares about the destruction of Nineveh.

Zech. 11:2-3 is closely related to Jer. 25:36. Both passages mention the wailing of shepherds and the destruction of glory and even vegetation (cf. also Joel 1:10).

Hence among the prophets of the 8th-6th centuries, *šdd* exhibits a consistent semantic spectrum in its references to the destructive activity of invading armies, to plunder, killing, and the destruction of fields and cities. These aspects of the devastation of social life were then universalized and applied to other kinds of destruction.

4. *šōḏ in Prophetic Literature.* Of 19 total occurrences of *šōḏ,* 11 are found in the context of war, a relatively smaller percentage than was the case with the verb. Hence the noun exhibits an expanded meaning while yet maintaining the association with destructive human activity. Isa. 51:19 offers a good example of the use of *šōḏ* in connection with war: "These two things have befallen you — who will grieve with you? [cf. Nah. 3:7] — devastation *(šōḏ)* and destruction *(šeḇer),* famine and sword — who will comfort you? [read *yᵉnaḥᵃmēḵ* with 1QIsaª]?" Isa. 16:4 uses *šōḏ* parallel with *mēṣ* (lit. "squeezer, masher"). Together these words evoke the image of the grinding destruction the Moabites are trying to flee. Isa. 13:6 (against Babylon) and 22:4 ("oracle concerning the valley of vision") associate *šōḏ* with the day of Yahweh. In both passages an army prepared by Yahweh invades the country. One can find similar examples in Jer. 6:7; 48:3; Hos. 7:13; 9:6; 10:14; Am. 3:10; Hab. 1:3.

The conditions described by *šōḏ* can also come about, however, even when external enemies are not the cause. For example, Isa. 59:7 relates that "their feet run to evil, and they rush to shed innocent blood; their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity *('āwen),* desolation *(šōḏ)* and destruction *(šeḇer)* are in their highways." Here no external enemy is responsible, and the destruction emerges rather from the act-consequence nexus. In Isa. 60:18 Yahweh promises that *šōḏ* and *šeḇer* will cease. Two centuries earlier Amos (Am. 3:10) reprimanded Israel: "They do not know how to do right . . . those who store up violence and oppression *(ḥāmās wāšōḏ)* in their strongholds." Jer. 6:7 reproaches *ḥāmās wāšōḏ* in Jerusalem (cf. below). Ezk. 45:9 advises the princes to put away "violence and oppression" and to do what is "just and right" *(mišpāṭ ûṣᵉḏāqâ).* The context mentions the eviction of Israelites from their property. According to Hos. 12:2(1), Ephraim is multiplying "falsehood *(kāzāḇ)* and violence *(šōḏ)*" (hendiadys) through its alliance with Assyria and Egypt and in so doing is preparing its own downfall.

The meaning of *šōḏ* is illuminated by the fact that in 10 of 19 occurrences it appears together with *šeḇer* (4 times) or *ḥāmās* (6 times). In all 3 occurrences in Deutero-Isaiah, *šōḏ* appears together with *šeḇer* (cf. also Jer. 48:3, the oracle against Moab). The basic meaning of → שׁבר *šeḇer,* "break to pieces," complements the meaning of *šōḏ,* "destruction," the two words together expressing the dissolution and annihilation of the nation. Unlike *šōḏ,* neither *šeḇer* nor *ḥāmās* is used in exclusively poetic texts. The term *ḥāmās* can refer to physical violence (as in Jgs. 9:24) as well as to unjust or harsh treatment (as in Gen. 16:5). The word pair *ḥāmās/šōḏ* encompasses both meanings. All 6 examples (Jer. 6:7; 20:8; Ezk. 45:9; Am. 3:10; Hab. 1:3; 2:17) can be associated with violent oppression. Hab. 1:3 develops *šōḏ wᵉḥāmās* (the only passages attest-

ble," *History of Religions* 21 (1981/82) 240-56; E. Burrows, "The Meaning of El Šaddai," *JTS* 41 (1940) 152-61; F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), esp. 52-60; M. Delcor, "Des inscriptions de Deir ʿAlla aux traditions bibliques, à propos des *šdyn*, des *šedim* et de *šadday*," *Die Väter Israels. FS J. Scharbert* (Stuttgart, 1989), 33-40; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Baal *RPU* in KTU 1.108; 1.113 und nach 1.17 VI 25-33," *UF* 12 (1980) 171-82, esp. 174, 177; J. Ebach, *Weltentstehung und Kulturentwicklung bei Philo von Byblos. BWANT* 108 (1979), esp. 196-214; O. Eissfeldt, "Jahwes Verhältnis zu ʿEljon und Schaddaj nach Psalm 91," *WO* 2 (1954/59) 343-48 = *KlSchr* 3 (1966), 441-47; J. Felton, "El Shaddai," *Dor le Dor* 16 (1987/88) 186-91; D. N. Freedman, "Divine Names and Titles in Early Hebrew Poetry," *Magnalia Dei: FS G. E. Wright* (Garden City, N.Y., 1976), 55-107; idem, "The Divine Name EL SHADDAI, 'He Who Created Families,'" *Dor le Dor* 9 (1980/81) 72-78; W. R. Garr, "The Grammar and Interpretation of Exodus 6:3," *JBL* 111 (1992) 385-408; M. Görg, "*Šaddaj-Ehrenrettung — einer Etymologie,*" *BN* 16 (1981) 13-15; R. Gordis, "The Biblical Root *ŠDY-ŠD:* Notes on 2 Sam I 21; Jer XVIII 14; Ps XCI 6; Job V 21," *JTS* 41 (1940) 35-43 = *The Word and the Book* (New York, 1976), 323-31; W. Gross, "Jakob, der Mann des Segens. Zu Traditionsgeschichte und Theologie der priesterschriftlichen Jakobsüberlieferungen," *Bibl* 49 (1968) 321-44; idem, "Israels Hoffnung auf die Erneuerung des Staates," in J. Schreiner, ed., *Unterwegs zur Kirche. Alttestamentliche Konzeptionen. QD* 110 (1987), 87-122, esp. 94-98; J. A. Hackett, *The Balaam Text from Deir ʿAllā. HSM* 31 (1984), esp. 85-89; idem, "Religious Traditions in Israelite Transjordan," *Ancient Israelite Religion. FS F. M. Cross* (Philadelphia, 1987), 125-36, esp. 133-34; M. Haran, "The Religion of the Patriarchs," *ASTI* 4 (1965) 30-55; J. Hehn, *Die biblische und die babylonische Gottesidee* (Leipzig, 1913), esp. 265-71; M. Herranz, "Demonología del A.T.: los sedim," *EstBíb* 27 (1968) 301-13; P. Hugger, *Jahwe meine Zuflucht. MüSt* 13 (1971), esp. 167-70; E. A. Knauf, "El Šaddai," *BN* 16 (1981) 20-26; idem, "El Šaddai — der Gott Abrahams?" *BZ* 29 (1985) 97-103; K. Koch, "Šaddaj. Zum Verhältnis zwischen israelitischer Monolatrie und nordwest-semitischem Polytheismus," *VT* 26 (1976) 299-332 = *Studien zur alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1988), 118-52; idem, "Die Götter, denen die Väter dienten," *Studien zur alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte,* 9-31, esp. 25-30; M. Köckert, *Vätergott und Väterverheissungen. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Albrecht Alt und seinen Erben. FRLANT* 142 (1988), esp. 79-81; G. van der Kooij and M. Ibrahim, eds., *Picking Up the Threads . . . A Continuing Review of Excavations at Deir ʿAlla, Jordan* (Leiden, 1989), esp. 62-70; J. Lévêque, *Job et son dieu. ÉBib* (2 vols.; 1970), esp. I, 163-79; C. E. L'Heureux, "Searching for the Origins of God," *Traditions in Transformation. FS F. M. Cross* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1981), 33-57; N. Lohfink, "Die priesterschriftliche Abwertung der Tradition von der Offenbarung des Jahwenamens an Mose," *Bibl* 49 (1968) 1-8 = *Studien zum Pentateuch. SBAB* 4 (1988), 71-78; O. Loretz, "Der kanaanäische Ursprung des biblischen Gottesnamens El Šaddaj," *UF* 12 (1980) 420-21; E. C. B. Maclaurin, "Shaddai," *AbrN* 3 (1961/62) 99-118; idem, "The Development of the Idea of God in Ancient Canaan," *Journal of Religious History* 2 (1962/63) 277-94; T. Mende, *Durch Leiden zur Vollendung. Die Elihureden im Buch Ijob (Ijob 32–37). TTS* 49 (1990); T. N. D. Mettinger, *In Search of God* (Philadelphia, 1988); J. Morgenstern, "The Divine Triad in Biblical Mythology," *JBL* 64 (1945) 15-37; H.-P. Müller, "Gott und die Götter in den Anfängen der biblischen Religion. Zur Vorgeschichte des Monotheismus," in O. Keel, ed., *Monotheismus im Alten Israel und seiner Umwelt. Biblische Beiträge* 14 (1980), 99-142; idem, "Die aramäische Inschrift von Deir ʿAllā und die älteren Bileamsprüche," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 214-44, esp. 223, 239; G.-W. Nebe, "Psalm 104,11 aus Höhle 4 von Qumran (4QPs^{d}) und der Ersatz des Gottesnamens," *ZAW* 93 (1981) 284-90; H. Niehr, *Der höchste Gott. Alttestamentlicher JHWH-Glaube im Kontext syrisch-kanaanäischer Religion des 1. Jahrtausends v.Chr. BZAW* 190 (1990); M. Oliva, "Las revelaciones a los patriarcas en la historia sacerdotal," *Bibl* 55 (1974) 1-14; J. Ouellette, "More on *ʾÊl Šadday* and *Bêl Šadê,*" *JBL* 88 (1969) 470-71; A. Passoni dell'Acqua, "*ʾēl šaddaj.* Un nome divino ancora misterioso," *BeO* 22 (1980) 31-54;

I. 1. *Etymology.* Contemporary scholarship advances varying derivations with regard to the origin of the DN *šadday.*[1]

a. *Field.* Taking as his point of departure Ugar. *ʿṯtrt šd,* "Astarte of the field/meadow," Weippert concluded the existence of a deity *ʾēl śādeh/śāday,* "god of the field," albeit without providing textual evidence for the existence of such a deity.[2] Proposals advanced elsewhere concur with this view.[3] Ebach and Wifall picked up Weippert's proposal and developed it further.[4] It was Loretz, however, who in 1980 provided the crucial supporting text for this argumentation with reference to the passage *il šd yṣd,* "El of the 'field,' who hunts."[5]

A. Caquot relates that a text discovered in 1992 mentions the dual deity *ydd w šd.*[6] Because *šd qdš* allegedly occurs, one might conclude that a deity called *šd* was worshiped in Ugarit.

Semantically Akk. *šadû,* "open country, steppe," provides the root, a substantive

---

W. H. Propp, "On Hebrew *ŚADE(H),* 'Highland,'" *VT* 37 (1987) 230-36; W. Reiss, "Zur Deutung von *ʾl šdy* in der rabbinischen Literatur," *Frankfurter Judaistische Beiträge* 3 (1975) 65-75; M. Rösel, "Die Übersetzung der Gottesnamen in der Genesis-Septuaginta," *Ernten, was man sät. FS K. Koch* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1991), 357-77, esp. 373-74; L. Rost, "Die Gottesverehrung der Patriarchen im Lichte der Pentateuchquellen," *Congress Volume, Oxford 1959. SVT* 7 (1960), 346-59; H. Rouillard, *La Péricope de Balaam (Nombres 22–24). La Prose et les "Oracles." ÉBib N.S.* 4 (1985), esp. 345-46; J. Van Seters, "The Religion of the Patriarchs in Genesis," *Bibl* 61 (1980) 220-33; J.-L. Ska, "Quelques remarques sur P^{g} et la dernière rédaction du Pentateuque," in A. de Pury, ed., *Le Pentateuque en question* (Geneva, 1989), 95-125; F. Stolz, *Strukturen und "figuren im Kult von Jerusalem. BZAW* 118 (1970), esp. 157-61; H. Vorländer, *Mein Gott. AOAT* 23 (1975), esp. 215-19; N. Walker, "A New Interpretation of the Divine Name 'Shaddai,'" *ZAW* 72 (1960) 64-66; P. Weimar, *Untersuchungen zur priesterschriftlichen Exodusgeschichte. FzB* 9 (1973), esp. 81-103; idem, "Gen 17 und die priesterschriftliche Abrahamgeschichte," *ZAW* 100 (1988) 22-60; J. P. Weinberg, "Gott im Weltbild des Chronisten: Die vom Chronisten verschwiegenen Gottesnamen," in O. Kaiser, ed., *Lebendige Forschung im AT. ZAW* 100 Sup (1988) 170-89, esp. 180-81, 187; M. Weippert, "Erwägungen zur Etymologie des Gottesnamens ʾĒl Šaddaj," *ZDMG* 111 (1961) 42-62; idem, "שַׁדַּי *šadday* (divine name)," *TLOT,* III, 1304-10; W. Wifall, "El Shaddai or the El of the Fields," *ZAW* 92 (1980) 24-32; R. Zadok, *The Pre-Hellenistic Israelite Anthroponymy and Prosopography. OLA* 28 (1988); I. Zoller, "Il nome divino *Šadday,*" *RSO* 13 (1931) 73-75; F. Zorell, "Der Gottesname 'Shaddai' in den alten Übersetzungen," *Bibl* 8 (1927) 215-19; an enumeration of earlier bibliographical materials concerning the divine name can be found in C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36. CC* (Eng. trans. 1985), 117-18.

1. Detailed surveys of scholarship till 1980 can be found in Weippert, *TLOT,* III, 1306-9; Vorländer, 215-19; Koch, *VT* 26 (1976) 308; Ebach, 197-99 n. 8.

2. *KTU* 1.48, 17; 1, 91, 10; 1.148, 18; 4.182, 55, 58. See Weippert, "Erwägungen"; but cf. *TLOT,* III, 1308.

3. M. H. Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts. SVT* 2 (1955), 64-68; Ouellette; R. de Vaux, *Early History of Israel* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1978), 274-78, here 277: "Lord of the Steppe."

4. Wifall, 196-214.

5. Loretz, 421; *KTU* 1.108, 12.

6. "Discours inaugural," *XIVème Congrès de l'Organisation Internationale pour l'étude de l'AT. Programme et résumés* (Paris, 1992), 15. The text is RS 92.2016, according to P. Bordreuil and D. Pardee.

also attested in Ugarit with this meaning.[7] Additional forms include *ša-de$_4$-e*, "meadow," Phoen. *šd*, "plain," and OSA *šdw*, "mountain, cultivated land."[8]

The problematic condition of the text of *KTU* 1.108, 10-13, however,[9] burdens the interpretation of *šadday* against the background of l. 12 with considerable uncertainty, to which are added philological difficulties and issues of content. First, it is questionable whether *il* in l. 12 is to be understood as a divine name or as an appellative, the latter involving an understanding as the "god of the country/fields."[10] The lack of word separators prompts D. Pardee to undertake a different word division: *il šdy ṣd mlk*, "the god šadayyu, the hunter (of?) *milku*," understanding *il šdy* to be the chthonic god *šed* in his primitive form from the 2nd millennium.[11] It is also not clear whether in the reading *il šd yṣd* the subst. *šd* is to be taken as a genitive of *il* or as the object of the verb in the sense "the god travels through the countryside."[12] From the perspective of the history of religions, El's association with a field resists interpretation. Hurrian religion associates the war goddess Ishtar-Shawushka of Shamuha epithetically with a (battle) field.[13] This goddess appears in the Akkadian texts from Ugarit as *Ištar ṣēri* and in the Ugaritic texts as *'ṯtrt šd*.[14] No relationship to the god El, however, is discernible.[15]

b. *Mountain*. After F. Delitzsch established a connection between Akk. *šadû*, "mountain," and Heb. *šadday*, other scholars quickly picked up this suggestion and adduced additional support from the perspective of content.[16] This view became widely known through Albright's renewed discussion, which with reference to P. Dhorme assumed an original meaning "breast."[17] Against the background of *šaddā'u/šaddû'a*, "mountain dweller," Albright came to understand Heb. *šadday* as "the one of the mountain."[18] This view, with various nuances, was widely accepted.[19]

---

7. *AHw*, III, 1124-25; *CAD*, XVII, 49-59; *KTU* 1.6, IV, 12; 1.12, II, 43; 1.24, 22.

8. For the Akkadian see EA 287:56 (Knudtzon: *ša-te-e*); cf. W. L. Moran, *The Amarna Letters* (Eng. trans., Baltimore, 1992), 328. On Phoenician see *DNSI*, II, 1110. For OSA see Beeston, 131; Biella, 511.

9. Dietrich and Loretz, 174.

10. A. Caquot, *TO*, II, 116-17 n. 359.

11. Pardee, *Ras-Shamra-Ougarit IV* (Paris, 1988), 81-82, 110.

12. *TO*, II, 116-17 n. 359; cf. Knauf, *BZ* 29 (1985) 97.

13. See I. Wegner, *Gestalt und Kult der Ištar-Šawuška in Kleinasien*. *AOAT* 36 (1981), 28, 32-33.

14. RS 17.352, 12; *KTU* 1.48, 17; 1.91, 10; 1.148, 18; 4.182, 55, 58.

15. Weippert, *TLOT*, III, 1308.

16. Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1896), 642-43. Cf. F. Hommel, *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition* (Eng. trans., London, 1897), 108-11; Hehn, 265-71.

17. Albright, 180-93; É. P. Dhorme, "L'Emploi métaphorique de noms des parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien," *RB* 31 (1922) 230-31.

18. See idem, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (1968; repr. Winona Lake, Ind., 1990), 94 n. 140; *AHw*, III, 1123-24; *CAD*, XVII, 43.

19. Cf. Burrows; E. Dhorme, "Le nom du Dieu d'Israël," *RHR* 141 (1952) 7; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob*. *KAT* XVI (1963), 152-53; Bailey; Ouellette; H. Gese, in Gese et al., *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer*. *RM* 10/2 (1970), 133-34; Cross, 52-60; → I, 256-57;

c. *Breast.* The understanding of Heb. *šadday* as "breast" is related to *šadû*, "mountain," but moves away from this etymological basis in scholarly discussion in that this interpretation of *'ēl šadday* as a god with breasts takes place against the background of the promises of increase in the book of Genesis (cf. Zoller). The "God with breasts" is explained by way of an assimilation of Canaanite fertility gods with Yahweh, a process leading to an "androgynous monotheism" (cf. Biale). The accompanying textual interpretations, however, are rather far-fetched, and as such the explanation of *'ēl šadday* based on them is untenable.[20]

d. *Protective Spirit.* The derivation from Akk. *šēdu*, "demon," leads into yet another interpretive sphere; based in part on the notion of protection by *šadday*, this derivation proposes the meaning "God of protection."[21] The OT attests *šēḏîm* in Dt. 32:17; Ps. 106:37; and perhaps Job 19:29.[22] According to Delcor,[23] the reference is to original *šaddayîm* deities that were dedivinized and reduced to *šēḏ* demons.

e. *Rescuer.* The only non-Semitic etymology for *šadday* was first proposed by D. B. Redford, who adduced the Egyptian vb. *šdy*, "rescue," and the subst. *šd*, "rescuer," a suggestion picked up by H. Seebass.[24] After Knauf rejected this view, Görg tried to underpin it with phonetic, semantic, literary, and religio-historical argumentation.[25] Regarding the phonetic history, however, E. A. Knauf pointed out that Egyp. s_2 corresponds to Heb. *ś* in two common inherited words.[26]

Even after an examination of these various etymological explanations, one must acknowledge[27] that still no satisfactory etymology for *šadday* has been presented and that the resolution of its etymology will have to await the emergence of additional relevant materials.

2. *Extrabiblical Occurrences.* a. *Deir 'Alla Inscription.* The inscription of Tell Deir 'Alla, whose language is related to Transjordanian Israelite with a tendency toward Ar-

---

Abel; Hackett, *Balaam Text,* 87; J. C. de Moor, *The Rise of Yahwism. BETL* 91 (1990), 125 nn. 116, 152; M. C. A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine. UBL* 8 (1990), 127 n. 270; *HAL,* IV, 1421; M. P. Knowles, "The Rock, His Work Is Perfect: Unusual Imagery for God in Deuteronomy XXXII," *VT* 39 (1989) 315.

20. Cf. Weippert, *TLOT,* III, 1307; Knauf, *BZ* 29 (1985) 97 n. 4; Korpel, *Rift,* 127, with n. 270; → שַׁד *šaḏ* (VI).

21. *AHw,* III, 1208. See T. Nöldeke, review of F. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebr.-aram. Wörterbuches zum AT* (1886), in *ZDMG* 40 (1886) 735-36; Vorländer, 218-19; B. Lang, *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority. SWBA* 1 (1983), 50-51.

22. See Müller, "Gott," 130.

23. Delcor, 36-39.

24. See *WbÄS,* IV, 563, 2-9,10-11; Redford, *A Study of the Biblical Story of Joseph (Genesis 37–50). SVT* 20 (1970), 129 n. 1; Seebass, *Geschichtliche Zeit und theonome Tradition in der Joseph-Erzählung* (Gütersloh, 1978), 117 n. 19.

25. Görg, 26 n. 32. See in this regard also H. Seebass, "Die Stammessprüche Gen 49,3-27," *ZAW* 96 (1984) 338.

26. "Zur Etymologie der Handhieroglyphe," *Göttinger Miszellen zur ägyptologischen Diskussion* 59 (1982) 29-39, esp. 32.

27. See Weippert, *TLOT,* III, 1306.

c. *Palmyra.* One Palmyrene inscription speaks of *bwl'str (wšdy') 'lyh' ṭby'*.[37] The primary god of Palmyra, Bel, is here summarized together with his paredrial (wife) Astart[38] and joined by an otherwise unattested Palmyrene god *šdy.* Müller compares him with the *šdyn* as powers that thwart disaster from Tell Deir 'Alla, whereas others adduce Akk. *šēdu,* "demon."[39] It is unclear whether the divine name is also related to the PN *šdy'*.[40]

d. *Genizah Texts.* The four references to Yahweh as *šadday* in the wisdom writing from the Cairo Genizah no longer really belong in the context of these extrabiblical witnesses, since this writing dates not to ca. 100 C.E. Egypt, but rather only to ca. 1200 C.E.[41]

A survey of extrabiblical witnesses thus shows that the etymologically obscure root *šdy* is attested as a divine name from the 8th century on (Tell Deir 'Alla). An earlier dating cannot be established with the help of the Canaanite PN *śd'm(y)* from Egypt, since this personal name belongs to the Ugaritic root *ṯdy.*[42] In any event, the divine designation *šadday* is attested in Transjordan and later in the North Arabic sphere.

Niehr

II. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* The DN *šadday* occurs 48 times reliably in the OT; Job 19:29 is disputed.[43] The name occurs in two forms. It occurs certainly 7 times together with *'ēl* (Gen. 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3; Ex. 6:3; Ezk. 10:5). Popular etymologies (see below) and the early translations show that *šadday* was understood as a proper noun; the association with *'ēl* thus probably represents an appositional rather than a construct expression.[44]

In Gen. 49:25 *wᵉ'ēṯ šadday* is frequently emended to *wᵉ'ēl šadday* following several Hebrew mss., Sam., LXX, and Pesh. (cf. *BHK, BHS*). Deducing an original Hebrew source from the LXX remains an uncertain undertaking, and one must remember that the LXX here, in rendering as *theós* + an emphatic personal pronoun, deviates from the translation of the reliably attested occurrences of *'ēl šadday* in the Pentateuch (so also

---

Judentum, II (Giessen, 1928), 42-43 n. 2; A. Caquot, "Chadapha à propos de quelques articles récents," *Syr* 29 (1952) 80; on Old North Arabic PNs with the element *śdy,* cf. Knauf, *BN* 16 (1981) 20-21; idem, *BZ* 29 (1985) 103 n. 36.

37. J. Cantineau, "Textes palmyréniens provenant de la fouille du temple de bêl," *Syr* 12 (1931) 130-32 (no. 11.6,9).

38. See J. Teixidor, *The Pantheon of Palmyra. Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain* 79 (Leiden, 1979), 8-9, 113-14.

39. Cf. Müller, "Gott," 130-31; *DNSI,* II, 1111; Knauf, *BN* 16 (1981) 26 n. 31.

40. *PNPI,* 61.

41. Cairo Genizah 1, 12; 8, 15; 11, 18; 16, 18. See H. P. Rüger, *Die Weisheitsschrift aus der Kairoer Geniza. WUNT* 53 (1991), 3-15, contra K. Berger, *Die Weisheitsschrift aus der Kairoer Geniza* (Tübingen, 1989), 76; idem, "Die Bedeutung der wiederentdeckten Weisheitsschrift aus der Kairoer Geniza für das NT," *NTS* 36 (1990) 420-28.

42. Cross, 53-54; Knauf, *BN* 16 (1981) 25-26. See in this regard Weippert, *TLOT,* III, 1305.

43. See below; see I.1.d above.

44. See Weippert, *TLOT,* III, 1305.

Considerable differences emerge in the frequency and use of the "short form" *šadday* and the "long form" *'ēl šadday*.[54] The long form accounts for only a small percentage of occurrences and is restricted to the narrow sphere of Priestly pentateuchal texts, Gen. 43:14, which is dependent on those texts, and Ezk. 10:5, also dependent on the priestly tradition. By contrast, the short form is more broadly attested, exhibiting a concentration in the discourses in Job. One striking feature is the rather extensive exclusivity with which the forms are used in the various literary parts, with overlappings occurring only by way of extremely late redactional insertions (the short form occurs in the Pentateuch only in Gen. 49:25 and Nu. 24:4,16; cf. Ezk. 1:24 [short form] alongside 10:5 [long form]). These findings give cause for caution; one "should not from the outset tie *šadday* exclusively to *'ēl* or interpret it as a mere epithet from the perspective of a traditional notion of *'ēl*."[55] Any interpretation must take as its point of departure individual passages and only from that perspective determine the differences between the long and short forms.

The term *šadday* is attested as a theophoric element in two (possibly three) personal names in Nu. 1; 2; 7; 10.[56]

2. *Use and Meaning.* The DN *šadday* was passed down to Israel and was adopted by eastern and southeastern neighbors only during the exilic period. The "fruitless results of all these proposed etymological derivations as far as the exegesis of the extant texts is concerned" make it likely that in Israel the divine designation was received as a pure personal name with no knowledge of its "original" (etymological) meaning.[57] The association of the name with *'ēl* was a secondary construction in the context of Priestly theological erudition in analogy to traditional divine designations after the model *'ēl* + epithet. "Through it P summarizes the various designations of the gods of the fathers and the El deities and thus emphasizes the uniqueness of the patriarchal period."[58]

a. *Pentateuch.* By exhibiting numerous repetitions of key words, thematic overlapping, and explicit cross references, the five occurrences in Gen. 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 48:3; and Ex. 6:3 constitute a self-enclosed group generally attributed to the basic Priestly Writing or to the Priestly redaction/composition of the Pentateuch. All these passages use the long form, *'ēl šadday*. The divine name is used sparsely and deliberately, serving as a preferred means of theological systematization. "P uses the divine name *'ēl šadday* only in divine discourse or in references other persons make to these divine discourses."[59]

---

54. Weippert, *TLOT,* III, 1305.
55. Koch, *VT* 26 (1976) 306.
56. See 2.d below.
57. Koch, *VT* 26 (1976) 309. See Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 258.
58. W. H. Schmidt, "אֵל *'ēl* God," *TLOT,* I, 109; cf. idem, *The Faith of the OT: A History* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1983), 20-23; Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 258; a different view is taken by Weippert, *TLOT,* III, 1309-10, albeit presupposing the emendation and early dating of Gen. 49:25.
59. Gross, *Bibl* 49 (1968) 322 n. 1.

The complex relationship between the texts appears differently from different perspectives.[60]

Three of the texts are connected by an explicit system of reference construed from the perspective of Ex. 6:3. In the divine discourses in connection with the appearances (*r'h* niphal) before Abraham (Gen. 17:1) and Jacob (35:11), the name appears emphatically at the beginning of the discourse in the divine self-predication ("formula of self-introduction") *'anî* + DN,[61] variously followed by two imperatives. Ex. 6:3 interprets the appearances in Gen. 17 and 35 in the sense of a theological systematization of the course of history distinguishing the patriarchal period from that of Moses/Israel; in an unspoken manner this also sets off the primal age — as an epoch in which no name was revealed — from the patriarchal age. "Hence P employs the dual name out of considerations of 'religious history.'"[62] "P is concerned with drafting in broad strokes a history of the world and of religion that moves toward a culmination in the Sinai revelation."[63] The use of a specific divine name for the patriarchal period underscores the significance P attributes to this period,[64] for according to this understanding of history, Yahweh's "self"-revelation begins not just with Moses but already with Abraham. On the other hand, this understanding also marks the caesura between the age of Moses and the preceding age in that, to simplify somewhat, *'ēl šadday* as the "God of promise" stands over against Yahweh as the "God who fulfills the promise."[65]

The self-introduction *'anî yhwh* standing emphatically in the first position in Ex. 6:3 and the divine statement concerning the earlier appearances recall the corresponding formula in Gen. 17 and 35. The absence of a corresponding appearance narrative in the Isaac complex does not derive from textual loss, but rather fits in with the overall inclination of the Priestly patriarchal story, which tends to "devalue" Isaac in favor of Abraham and Jacob.[66] It also underscores the overriding systematizing intentions that distinguish between the age of Moses and that of the patriarchs, the latter age formulaically represented in Ex. 6:3 by the trio of patriarchal names.[67] Two noteworthy features are first the sequence of the three designations *'elōhîm-*

60. Cf. N. Lohfink, "The Priestly Narrative and History," *Theology of the Pentateuch* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1994), 136-72; P. Weimar, "Struktur und Komposition der priesterschriftlichen Geschichtsdarstellung," *BN* 23 (1984) 81-134; *BN* 24 (1984) 138-62; H. C. White, "The Divine Oath in Genesis," *JBL* 92 (1973) 165-79; E. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken. SBS* 112 (^{2}1987), 38-39, 142, 152-55, etc.

61. On the problems associated with the expression and the function of the formula in the P texts, cf. Gross, *Bibl* 49 (1968) 330-31; Weimar, *Untersuchungen*, 87-91.

62. Koch, *VT* 26 (1976) 316.

63. Ibid., 321; on this entire complex cf. E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte. WMANT* 57 (1984), 430; J. Hempel, "Priesterkodex," *PW*, XXII/2, 1965; K. Koch, "Zwei Eckdaten der Quellenscheidung," *VT* 37 (1987) 462-66; Köckert, 80; Oliva, 9-10; Weimar, *Untersuchungen*, 96-103; idem, *BN* 24 (1984) 158; Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 258; E. Zenger, *Gottes Bogen*, 141-42; et al.

64. See Oliva, 10.

65. Ska, 123.

66. See Gross, *Bibl* 49 (1968) 321-22, 333.

67. See Weimar, *Untersuchungen*, 96-100; further Lohfink, 7.

yhwh-'ēl šadday in Ex. 6:2-3, the second name occupying the emphatic position in the self-introduction, and second the correspondence between the divine names in Gen. 17:1; 35:9-11; and Ex. 6:2-3. In Gen. 17:1 *yhwh* appears in action, and *'ēl šadday* in discourse (Weimar opposes, along with earlier comms., an alteration of *yhwh* in Gen. 17:1 that ignores the systematizing intentions of P; G. C. Macholz maintains that "the Israelite listener or reader of this text is explicitly told at the beginning that it is Yahweh who appeared to Abraham as *'ēl šadday,* thus directing the listener to understand correctly what follows, namely, not as something preliminary that is [only] said to Abraham, but rather as something addressing and immediately affecting the listener himself"[68]). In Gen. 35:9ff. *'elōhîm* appears in action and *'ēl šadday* in discourse, and in Ex. 6:2-3 *'elōhîm* in action and *yhwh/'ēl šadday* in discourse. On the one hand, this establishes the identity of *'elōhîm* and *'ēl šadday* with *yhwh;*[69] on the other hand, the DN *yhwh* constitutes the "theological bracket" between Gen. 17 and Ex. 6, acquiring special status thereby. The salient point is that the use of *'ēl šadday* is restricted to discourse; by contrast, at the narrative level God is designated by the expressions *yhwh* and *'elōhîm.*

Lohfink understands Ex. 6:2ff. in connection with Gen. 17 as a "devaluation of the tradition of the revelation of the Yahweh name to Moses,"[70] a devaluation allegedly diminishing Ex. 6 over against Gen. 17 in that the announcement of the name occurs not in an appearance narrative as such but in a divine saying, which P values less highly.[71] Ex. 6 also allegedly lacks the "high form of the divine self-introduction generated by subsequent commandments."[72] Lohfink concludes: "one must thus assume that for reasons no longer known to us P^G did not feel in a position to place the revelation of the name of *Yahweh* — along with so much else — into the patriarchal period, circumventing this problem by simply placing the revelation of a different name into the patriarchal period, namely, *'ēl šadday,* and by then lending more narrative weight to this revelation. The intention of Ex. 6:3 would then not be that of announcing an enhanced revelation, but rather simply to ascertain that the revelation of the name of Yahweh itself represents the continuation of a process of divine self-disclosure that takes place through the mediation of *names,* a process that allegedly already began during the patriarchal period."[73]

This position rejects R. Rendtorff's interpretation, which concludes from the jux-

---

68. Weimar, *Untersuchungen,* 85-87; Macholz, "Israel und das Land. Vorarbeiten zu einem Vergleich zwischen Priesterschrift und deuteronomistischem Geschichtswerk" (Habil. Heidelberg, 1969), 83.

69. See Weimar, *Untersuchungen,* 86-87; a different view is taken by Koch, *VT* 26 (1976) 302, who maintains that *šadday* is deposed by *yhwh* and as such represents a "preliminary stage" of Yahweh; cf. 322; idem, "Götter," 26; G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1972), 198.

70. Cf. also J.-L. Ska, "La place d'Ex $6_{2\text{-}8}$ dans la narration de l'exode," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 548; K.-H. Walkenhorst, "Hochwertung der Namenserkenntnis und Gottverbundenheit in der Hoehenlinie der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung," *AJBI* 6 (1980) 3-28.

71. Lohfink, 4ff.

72. Ibid., 7.

73. Ibid., 5.

taposition of the two verbs in Ex. 6:3: "Here נראה is set over against נודע and there can be no doubt that this is done intentionally and is part of the very deliberate language of the priestly document. The appearance of Jahweh is attributed to a preliminary stage, and with Moses something new is inaugurated: God allows himself to be known *as himself*."[74] The basis for solving the problem changes if the P texts are no longer viewed as parts of a "source" *(Quelle)* that was inserted into its present context only later, but rather from the very beginning as a "continuation" of a preexisting connection with moments of "continuity" and of "discontinuity,"[75] or, more precisely, are interpreted as the supporting pillars of a Priestly pentateuchal "composition."[76]

The interpretation of Ex. 6:2ff. emerges for Blum from three observations: (a) P's theology of the divine name does not lead to any consistent alteration of the divine names in the pre-Priestly texts of Gen. 12ff. (in contrast to the accommodation of the names *'aḇrām/'aḇrāhām* and *śāray/śārâ* before and after Gen. 17), (b) Ex. 6:2ff. is structured as an "initial revelation" without any reference to Ex. 3–5, and (c) Ex. 6:3 "bindingly interprets the entire preceding portrayal, including the resistant "unaccommodated" components, "bracketing them, as it were, and redefining them through the Priestly key."[77] Blum maintains that "although this divine revelation inserts itself into the narratively most advantageous position within the current discourse (cf. similarly Gen. 35:9-15!), it is not, as its contextual position might lead one to expect, formulated as a repeated revelation, apparently because it is to enjoy the undiminished compositional weight of the 'first' instance in which Yahweh turns to Moses/Israel. The contextual discontinuity of this section is to that extent the expression (or means of expression) of a competing claim over against the received tradition (esp. Ex. 3–4)."[78] According to Blum, the reason resides in the composition of P and its intention of establishing community with God in the cult, which presupposes a human community. "The announcement of the Yahweh name is precisely not yet made to the fathers, but rather only to Israel after it has become a people (cf. Gen. 47:27; Ex. 1:7) that will use this name in its capacity as a cultic community and 'on whom' the name will be 'put' (Nu. 6:27; [Lev. 9:22-23])."[79]

In picking up and continuing this point of departure, the divine name theology can be seen as a "response" of the P composition to a claim made in the earlier historical work. If the basic elements of the relationship with God are displaced back into primal and patriarchal history,[80] and if in this context Abraham acquires a key function

---

74. R. Rendtorff, "The Concept of Revelation in Ancient Israel," in W. Pannenberg, ed., *Revelation as History* (Eng. trans., New York, 1968), 30; cf. W. Zimmerli, "'Offenbarung' im AT," *EvT* 22 (1962) 17.

75. See Blum, *Vätergeschichte,* 430.

76. E. Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch. BZAW* 189 (1990), 229-32.

77. Ibid., 235.

78. Ibid.

79. Ibid., 295.

80. See Oliva, 10.

for the Priestly conception of Israel, then the redaction must deal with the fact that although the received work does indeed attest a *bᵉrîṯ* with Abraham (cf. Gen. 15:18* JE),[81] the revelation of the divine name that is genuinely constitutive for the cultically regulated relationship with God comes only in the narratively rather broadly developed divine appearance before Moses (Ex. 3–4). Hence P's "backward displacement intentions" encounter boundaries in that the strong emphasis on the role of Moses in the source text must be reconciled with the enhancement of Abraham. This goal is served by differentiating between the various revelatory periods involving the divine name, a differentiation making it possible for a new historical epoch to begin not just with Moses but already with Abraham, though without having to deny the "revelatory progress" associated with Moses; at the same time these distinctions everywhere still emphasize the independence of the divine subject supporting all of history (cf. Gen. 17:1).

Additional semantic aspects of the Priestly conception of *'ēl šadday* emerge from the concentration of three occurrences in the story of Jacob.[82] The texts are related to one another within the course of the narrative as the "announcement of blessing (Isaac's discourse to Jacob in Gen. 28:1-4 with a reference back to Gen. 17) — the theophany and mediation of blessing (divine discourse to Jacob in 35:9-13) — retrospective in the account of the theophany (Jacob's discourse to Joseph in 48:3-6)" with Gen. 35 as the compositional center. This centralizing process is underscored by several connections among the three texts.

The P witnesses in Genesis use the DN *'ēl šadday* in consistent lexeme combinations and motif contexts. God as *'ēl šadday* appears as a bestower of blessings especially to Jacob (Gen. 28:3; 35:9; 48:3), though also to Sarah (17:16), Isaac (17:16[?; corrupt text]),[83] and Ishmael (17:20). According to Gross, Abraham was also originally a recipient of the blessing of *'ēl šadday* (cf. the content of the blessing in 17:2,6 and the designation of the land as a blessing in 28:4), something then suppressed by the systematizing interests of P, which construes Abraham's status anew with the aid of the central category of "covenant" and distinguishes it from that of Jacob (with the central category "blessing").[84] The blessing of *'ēl šadday* encompasses (a) fertility and increase *(prh + rbh)* (17:20; 28:3; 48:4 [as a promise in the hiphil]; 35:11 [as the command to multiply in the qal impv.]) as a presupposition for (b) becoming a "great nation" with kings, which for P means "the people of Israel and the kings of Israel"[85] (17:4-6[cf. vv. 16,20]; 28:3; 35:11; 48:4; the kings

81. See P. Weimar, "Genesis 15: Ein redaktionskritischer Versuch," *Die Väter Israels. FS J. Scharbert* (Stuttgart, 1989), 401.

82. On the following material cf. Gross, *Bibl* 49 (1968) 321-44; R. Rendtorff, *Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch. JSOTSup* 89 (Eng. trans. 1990), 163-67; Weimar, *Untersuchungen,* 98ff.; idem, "Aufbau und Struktur der priesterschriftlichen Jakobsgeschichte," *ZAW* 86 (1974) 174-203; Zenger, *Gottes Bogen,* 152-54.

83. Cf. Gross, "Israels Hoffnung," 95 n. 29; Weimar, *ZAW* 100 (1988) 31.

84. A different view is taken by Blum, *Vätergeschichte,* 263-64; Weimar, *ZAW* 100 (1988) 40-47, 52-59; cf. also Rendtorff, *Problem,* 164-65; Ska, "Quelques remarques," 109-11.

85. Gross, "Israels Hoffnung," 97-98.

derive the notion from clan piety.[95] Rather, he finds contacts with late exilic prophetic eschatological expectations — more precisely: restoration hopes — of the sort attested in Jer. 3:16; 23:3; and Ezk. 36:11, and expressed by the salient word pair *rbh/prh,* something dating back not earlier than the 6th century. Hence there is no textual evidence for dating the long form back to the monarchy or earlier. The secondary association of the divine name with the theme of fertility might have been mediated by an etymological interpretation (associations with *šaḏ,* "breast"; cf. Gen. 49:25) of the otherwise "incomprehensible" name.[96]

Gen. 43:14 similarly uses the long form of the divine name. The dating and redactional-historical classification of this verse are disputed. Verse 14aα picks up a wish formula that is always associated with a divine subject,[97] one also attested in 1 K. 8:50 (Dtr); Neh. 1:11; Ps. 106:46; Dnl. 1:9; and, slightly modified, Jer. 42:12 (the prepositional phrase with *lipnê* is missing, though cf. *mippᵉnê* in v. 11), i.e., exclusively in (exilic/)postexilic texts, to be distinguished from its use in the presumably earlier passage Dt. 13:18(17) (without *lipnê;* different context). Hence it is unlikely that Gen. 43:14 predates the P passages treated above. Since 43:14 does not belong to P, one can either assume a secondary insertion of the long form of the divine name under the influence of Priestly usage, or attribute the entire complex to a late redaction of the Joseph story.[98] The appearance of the divine name in a wish for blessing corresponds to its use in P and in the other pentateuchal passages.[99]

In connection with an early dating of the text, the mention of *šadday* in Gen. 49:25 within the Joseph saying in vv. 22-26 has played a key role in the discussion of the religio-historical meaning of the worship of *('ēl) šadday* in pre-state Israel. Despite all the differences of opinion regarding how to resolve individual philological, form-, and redactional-critical problems attaching to the Joseph saying (e.g., the classification of v. 24a and v. 24b; the understanding of v. 24bβ; the identification of the earliest constituent parts; the redactional-critical classification of the "blessing" in the larger sense; a determination of the relationship between tribal sayings and the elements of blessing), more recent studies do nonetheless exhibit a consensus regarding the decisive point here, namely, the late dating of vv. 25-26.[100] The following positions have emerged regarding literary and redactional-critical issues. (a) Verses 25-26 as a whole are viewed as a secondary reception of Dt. 33:13-16.[101] (b) According to Köckert,[102] vv. 24b and 25a represent a subsequent redaction that theologically reworked the originally patriar-

---

95. Weimar, *Untersuchungen,* 153; idem, *ZAW* 100 (1988) 41-42.

96. See the analogies for popular etymological interpretations under I.1.c.

97. → רחם *rḥm* (III.1.b).

98. For the former see Koch, *VT* 26 (1976) 304 n. 7; Köckert, 79 n. 154. For an ascription to R^P, see N. Kebekus, *Die Joseferzählung* (Münster, 1990), 120-21, 344-45.

99. See C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50. CC* (Eng. trans. 1986), 122.

100. A different view is taken, e.g., by H. Seebass, *ZAW* 96 (1984) 334-39.

101. C. H. J. de Geus, *The Tribes of Israel* (Assen, 1976), 89-91; Van Seters, 226-27; cf. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50,* 239-40; H. J. Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte. BZAW* 95 (1965), 37.

102. Köckert, 66-67.

chal blessing; but vv. 25b and 26 already presuppose the stylization of Gen. 49 as a blessing that only took place later. If one excises vv. 24b and 25a from the present context, however, there is no transition from v. 24a to v. 25b and no introduction to the blessing itself, which is first created only by the "open" connection with the prep. *min* and the adoption of *gîḏê* in v. 24a. Moreover, v. 25a is connected with what follows by the key words *'āḇîḵā* and the wordplay *šadday-šāḏayim* (see below), suggesting that vv. 24a-26 originally constituted a unity from disparate "citations."[103] The parallel nature of the colons in v. 24b and v. 25a, their incorporation into the *min* series beginning with v. 24bα, and the development of the blessing of v. 25aβ in vv. 25b-26 (*birḵōṯ* 3 times + the verbal root) signal a formally rounded off context. The name *šadday* appears here in a series with three other divine names,[104] a phenomenon observed in several instances in connection with the use of *šadday* (cf. Nu. 24; Job; Ps. 68; 91).

The association of "God of your father" with *šadday* has a strikingly close correspondence in the Priestly theory of the historical epochs (Ex. 6:3; cf. the modification of *yhwh* from the earlier source Dt. 33:13[105]). An etymological inclination frequently found in the later passages using the divine name appears in the juxtaposition of *šadday* and *šāḏayim,* "breasts" (concerning the association of the divine name with fertility, see also the occurrences in the preliminary sources used by P).[106] As a guarantor of blessing, *šadday* is introduced as "a God of cosmic dimensions," a clear indication of the origin of this understanding of God from within the monotheistic postexilic period.[107] N. Kebekus maintains that the entire complex encompassing 49:1b-28b was first incorporated into the Joseph narrative only by R^P; literary observations regarding the Joseph saying suggest that its origin not be dated too much earlier.[108] Verse 25 thus does not indicate any connection between the Israelite worship of *('ēl) šadday* and the second-millennium common Semitic worship of *'ēl,* nor does it provide any basis for reconstructing a "patriarchal religion."[109]

The divine name occurs once each in the short form in the introductions to the third and fourth oracles of Balaam (Nu. 24:3b-9, v. 4b; 24:15-19, v. 16b). Hardly anyone still advocates an extremely early dating (12th century[110]). Advocates of the classic docu-

---

103. See Westermann, *Genesis 37–50,* 238-40, who discloses additional connections with other texts (Gen. 48:15-16; Nu. 6:24).

104. On the divine names individually, cf. the comms. and Köckert, 63, 65-67, 82-83.

105. On this whole complex see Van Seters, 227, who does, however, infer too hastily from an influence by the P theory to an actual redaction by P, something unlikely not least considering the use of the short form.

106. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. trans. 1997), 22-23; Stolz, 159.

107. Stolz, 159. See Knauf, *BN* 16 (1981) 23.

108. *Die Joseferzählung,* 209, 214, 345.

109. See Köckert, 79-81, 301-3.

110. See W. F. Albright, "The Oracles of Balaam," *JBL* 63 (1944) 233; on the various positions in general, cf. L. Schmidt, "Die alttestamentliche Bileamüberlieferung," *BZ* 23 (1979) 234; but cf. P. J. Budd, *Numbers. WBC* 5 (1984), 263; M. Margaliot, "Literary, Historical and Religious Aspects of the Balaam Narrative, Numbers 22–24," *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, 1990), 75-82; Wolters, *HUCA* 59 (1988) 112-13.

mentary hypothesis generally attribute Nu. 24:3ff. and 15ff. to J, finding in the sayings from the early monarchy *vaticinia ex eventu* for the high Davidic kingdom (this was long the general consensus[111]). By contrast, an increasing number of more recent scholars advocate not trying to attribute the material to any specific source and to date it to the (exilic-)postexilic period.[112] The most important reasons for redating include (a) the impossibility of distinguishing sources;[113] (b) the difficulty in understanding certain motifs within the context of the 10th/9th centuries; (c) insight into the literary (!) dependence of the sayings on later texts (see below); and (d) the new discussion of dating raised by the Deir ʿAlla texts.[114]

Rather than basing their conclusions on additional independent witnesses for the postulated genre, earlier determinations of the genre of Nu. 24:3b-9 and 15b-19 as a "seer's oracle" assessed the sayings' position within a genre history of prophetic discursive forms on the basis of the assumed extreme age of the text.[115] Whereas this method lacks the methodological presuppositions for any critical determination of genre, such determination collapses completely with a late dating of these texts. The interpretation thus remains completely dependent on the unique text within its OT context and on the parallels in 2 S. 23:1-3[116] and the texts from Deir ʿAlla; the similarities with the Deir ʿAlla texts become more comprehensible if one assumes direct literary influence than if one hypothesizes mediation by way of a common genre "seer's oracle." The frequent isolation of sayings II and IV from the context and the assertion of their extreme age and of their original independence from the Balaam narratives depend basically on the form-critical and form-historical assessment of the initial introduction of the speaker, which is assessed as an indication of the original contextual independence. Against this position one can counter that (a) the renewed naming and "introduction" of Balaam do not necessarily refer to Balaam himself, but rather to the

111. Cf. among others L. Schmidt, *BZ* 23 (1979) 253-57; idem, *TRE,* VI, 636-37; H.-J. Zobel, "Bileam-Lieder und Bileam-Erzählung," *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. FS R. Rendtorff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1990), 153-54; Müller, *ZAW* 94 (1982) 215 n. 12; K. Seybold, "Das Herrscherbild des Bileamorakels Num. 24,15-19," *TZ* 29 (1973) 1-19.

112. Cf. W. Gross, *NBL,* I, 300, who favors a messianic-eschatological interpretation; B. Diebner and H. Schult, "Alter und geschichtlicher Hintergrund von Gen 24," *DBAT* 8 (1975) 11-17; earlier already A. von Gall, "Zusammensetzung und Herkunft der Bileam-Perikope in Num 22–24," *FS B. Stade* (Giessen, 1900), 2-47.

113. See the problems already in L. M. von Pákozdy, "Theologische Redaktionsarbeit in der Bileam-Perikope," *Von Ugarit nach Qumran. FS O. Eissfeldt. BZAW* 77 (1958), 161-76.

114. See M. Delcor, "Le texte de Deir ʿAlla et les oracles bibliques de Balaám," *Congress Volume, Vienna 1980. SVT* 32 (1981), 72-73; on late dating cf. also O. Kaiser, *Intro. to the OT* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1975), 108-9; Vorländer, 216; Rouillard makes more incisive distinctions regarding origins (see below).

115. Cf. C. Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (Eng. trans., repr. Louisville, 1991), 188-89; H. F. Fuhs, *Sehen und Schauen. FzB* 32 (1978), 161-66; D. Vetter, *Seherspruch und Segensschilderung. CThM* 4 (1974); idem, "חזה *ḥzh* to see," *TLOT,* I, 400-401; idem, "נְאֻם *nᵉʾum* utterance," *TLOT,* II, 692-93; H. Eising, → "נְאֻם *nᵉʾum,*" IX, 110 (II); a critical view in A. Jepsen, → חזה *ḥāzâ (chāzāh),* IV, 284-85 (IV).

116. See Rouillard, 352-54.

self."[125] The rare lexeme *maḥᵃzēh* (occurring otherwise only in Gen. 15:1;[126] Ezk. 13:7) with its verbal root *ḥzh* describes the visionary aspect of a comprehensive divinatory phenomenon that includes first of all a reception of the word ("hearing utterances").[127] Verses 4bβ and 16bβ underscore the visionary aspect with a reference to an otherwise unexplainable participation of the eyes, to be distinguished from vv. 3bβ and 15bβ in that *šᵉṯum hā'āyin* (sg.!) refers, as in the parallel 2 S. 23:1b, to a characteristic of Balaam (maliciousness or something similar).[128] Nor can one exclude the possibility that *npl* might refer to ecstatic-visionary phenomena.[129] "Balaam was thus the recipient of divine revelation, both auditory and visionary,"[130] whose content is then meditated in the corpus of oracles in vv. 5ff.,17ff.; cf. already the mediation of the revelation of the *word* as emphatically prepared by the repeated *nᵉ'um.* The reference is to mysterious knowledge of the future (cf. 24:14,17)[131] that only God has and that only he discloses. Nu. 24:16aβ is not concerned with "knowledge of God" with practical consequences according to the usual use of *da'aṯ* + *'ᵉlōhîm/yhwh.* The use of *šadday* alongside other divine names such as *'ēl* (in the Balaam pericope also in 23:8,19,22,23; 24:8,24) and *'elyôn* (only once) in the poetic sections in Nu. 24* corresponds to the inclination to use variations in Gen. 49*, though especially to such use in the poetic sections of Job and in Ps. 68; 91. The similarity with the alternation of divine names, for example, in Job makes it unlikely that *šadday* and *'elyôn* here are to be understood as epithets of *'ēl;* they function rather, as do the isolated *'ēl* in late texts, as equally interchangeable designations for *yhwh.*[132]

"Both 2 S. 23:1-2 and the beginning of the Aramaic text from Deir 'Alla simultaneously serve as the preliminary literary source *(Vorlage)* for the introductions to the two final poems."[133] Two parallels between Nu. 24 and the Deir 'Alla texts deserve special attention: (a) the terminological similarities in the reception of revelation (the poor condition of the Deir 'Alla text makes a reconstruction extremely difficult);[134] (b) mention of *šdyn* alongside *'lhn.*[135] Even though considering the parallels one cannot deny that the OT authors of the Balaam oracles were familiar with a text similar to that of Deir 'Alla, the exact nature of such dependency remains unclear. What is clear is that Nu. 22–24 presupposes "a longer tradition history both outside and inside the Israelite

---

126. R[P] according to Weimar, "Genesis 15," 394.

127. See H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 124. Cf. A. Jepsen, → IV, 283-85; Fuhs, *Sehen und Schauen,* 154, 166-68; Köckert, 214-15.

128. According to Rouillard, 345-51; cf. already *RHB,* II, 203.

129. Cf. J. M. Allegro, "The Meaning of the Phrase *šeṯūm hā'ayin* in Num. XXIV 3, 15," *VT* 3 (1953) 78-79; Wagner, *ThV* 5 (1975) 21; Rouillard, 351.

130. Noth, *Numbers,* 190; cf. Vetter, *TLOT,* I, 401.

131. W. Gross, *Bileam. Literar- und formkritische Untersuchung der Prosa in Num. 22–24. SANT* 38 (1974), 317-20.

132. See F. M. Cross, → "אֵל *'ēl,*" I, 258-59 (III.1.d).

133. Rouillard, 485.

134. Deir 'Alla I 1-2; cf. Hackett, *Balaam Text,* 25, 29-37; Delcor, 33-34.

135. Deir 'Alla, I 5-6; cf. Hackett, *Balaam Text,* 25, 29, 38-43.

sphere."[136] According to Delcor,[137] the author of the third and fourth Balaam oracles has demythicized his sources and gone beyond the Deir ʿAlla text by the addition of *ʿelyôn*. Müller finds precisely in the oracle of disaster for its own people attested by the Deir ʿAlla text the point of departure for a positive reception and engagement of the figure of Balaam for a poetic-religious enhancement of Israelite kingship.[138] "Hence in Nu. 24:3-9,15-19, Balaam appears as one who proclaims salvation and blessing for Israel, and who does so in a logical reversal of his own proclamation of disaster to the foreigners and yet simultaneously by picking up directly on a prospect of salvation of the sort disclosed in a concluding fashion in Deir ʿAlla I 13ff. and perhaps also in II 14,18."[139]

A synchronic look at the previously examined occurrences and at their most important reference texts discloses the key position of Nu. 24 within a broadly drawn matrix of cross references extending from Gen. 15 and 17 to 2 S. 23[140] and connecting the "eternal covenant" with Abraham with the assurance of the "eternal covenant" to David. The DN *šadday* and the rare lexemes used in its immediate contexts along with its distinctive expressions constitute this matrix, one developed in a scholarly manner at an extremely late stage of the text.

b. *Job.* Job has special status in that about two-thirds of all occurrences of *šadday* (31) are found in this book, something also commensurate with the equally striking cumulation of the late expression *ʾelôah* in Job 3–40. "Whereas the name Yahweh is basically restricted to the prose, narrative parts and superscriptions, the various divine designations (except in customary idioms within the framework story) are found in poetically structured direct discourse. The framework story uses the usual form אלהים, which is rare in the Job poem, which otherwise prefers the forms אל and אלוה along with שׁדי."[141] The shifting use of different divine names in Job corresponds to a similar practice observable in other late texts (cf. Gen. 49; Nu. 24; Ruth 1; Ps. 68; 91).

Here is a statistical overview of Job 3–31; 38:1–42:6 (Elihu discourses in chs. 32–37 as a comparison given in parentheses):

ʾēl	36 times	(19 times);
ʾelôah	35 times	(6 times);
šadday	25 times	(6 times);
ʾelōhîm	4 times	(2 times);
yhwh	with the exception of 12:9, only 5 times in the discourse introductions in 38:1–42:6	

136. Müller, *ZAW* 94 (1982) 242 n. 184.

137. Delcor, 39-40.

138. *ZAW* 94 (1982) 242-43.

139. Ibid., 243; see idem, *ZDPV* 94 (1978) 58-59.

140. See R. J. Tournay, "Les 'dernières paroles de David,' II Samuel XXIII, 1-7," *RB* 88 (1981) 481-504.

141. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 117; cf. Cross, → אֵל *ʾēl,* I, 259; on earlier interpretations of the alternation of divine names in Job, see Lévêque, 168-72.

Reasons for this reserve in using the name *yhwh* and for the preference for other divine designations in the citations in the discourses include the foreign setting ("Arabia in the broadest sense"[142]), the "staging" as a dialogue among non-Israelites, and the archaizing tendency, which together with the stylization of Job as a patriarch[143] influence the adoption of the DN *šadday,* which was typical of the patriarchal period (cf. Ex. 6:3; "and so this poet so often seems to be using this word, which asserts that Job was a contemporary patriarch and he may have had a certain reputation for holiness and a venerable appearance"[144]). In Job the DN *šadday* is used by all the dialogue partners and is thus not bound to any particular theological position within the disputes. The distribution of the word within the overall book is significant in that the name is by no means equally dispersed.[145] Two-thirds of the occurrences are found in the second half of the book, and the concentration in what is known as the third round of discourses in significant. The divine name occurs here 5 times in one Eliphaz discourse (ch. 22) and 6 times in Job's speech, then another 3 times in Job's appeal to God (chs. 29–31), 6 times in the Elihu discourses, and the last time in Yahweh's "short" discourse (40:2) after the first "storm" theophany (this is also the only occurrence of the divine name in the Yahweh discourses). Hence even before any discussion of individual passages and groups of passages (and even though many redactional-historical problems attaching to the book are still unresolved), one finds that "the *šadday* reference occupies a central position at the culmination of the growing dispute between Job and his God"; this title "exercises a significant function with regard to the conception of the entire dialogue."[146] The following individual observations confirm and develop this thesis.

Particularly conscious use is discernible in chs. 29–40. Job's final appeal to God ends in 31:35 with the demand, "Let *šadday* answer me!" something commensurate with the use of the name in the brief, epilogue-like Yahweh speech to Job (40:1-2) after the first storm theophany[147] (the juxtaposition of *yhwh* in the discourse introduction [v. 1] and *šadday/ᵉlôah* in the citation of the discourse [v. 2] maintains the identity of the entities; cf. the noteworthy correspondence to Gen. 17:1), in which Job is challenged to take a position regarding God's previous "justification." The divine name also appears at the beginning of Job's final great discourse, chs. 29–31 (29:5). The lament is preceded by a contrasting retrospective on the earlier, happier period as described after the fashion of an abbreviated formula with the aid of the formula of assistance, "when *šadday* was still with me."

---

142. Knauf, *BN* 16 (1981) 22 n. 12; on the probable origin of the name within this region, see I above.

143. See L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger and G. Steins, "Zur Entstehung, Gestalt und Bedeutung der Ijob-Erzählung (Ijob 1f.; 42)," *BZ* 33 (1989) 18.

144. *GesTh,* 1366; also N. C. Habel, *Job. OTL* (1985), 135; a thorough discussion in Lévêque, 175-79.

145. Contra Fohrer, *Hiob,* 117.

146. Koch, *VT* 26 (1976) 315.

147. See ibid.

The divine name occurs 5 times in the final Eliphaz discourse (ch. 22),[153] which in its turn references Job's preceding remarks (ch. 21). Here the name *šadday* functions as a guiding word. The discourse picks up the question, "What is *šadday,* that we should serve him? And what profit do we get if we pray to him?"[154] from the citation of the preceding blasphemous position (21:15) and delivers a two-part answer, namely, that God/*šadday* receives no pleasure from such worship (22:3) and that returning to him (*šûḇ ʿaḏ-šadday,* 22:23) results in restoration (?) and in a turning away from perversion and a return to joy in him (*ʿng* hithpael *ʿal-šadday,* 22:26; cf. 27:10). Job 22:24-25 then metaphorically explicates the new meaning of *šadday* for the believer. He will become like gold and precious silver for the believer. Job 22:17, with v. 18, is presumably a late addendum[155] that employs a rhetorical question in addressing the theme of the seeming inactivity of *šadday* toward the wicked.

In the section 27:10-13, too, the frequent use of *šadday* functions as a leitmotif. Verse 10 raises questions concerning the wicked's distance from God (cf. 22:26); the definitive statement concerning their fate comes in vv. 11-13, where Job announces that he knows *šadday*'s intention with regard to the wicked (v. 11). Verse 13 then explicates the "heritage" that the "oppressors" receive from *šadday (ḥēleq-ʾāḏām/naḥᵃlaṯ ʿārîṣîm miššadday + lqḥ);* similar is 31:2, albeit in reference to Job (Mende maintains that 27:10-13 was the product of late redaction;[156] concerning the use of the divine name in connection with statements about the fate of the wicked, cf. also 21:15; 22:17).

Because *šadday* appears as a personal counterpart to human beings, one might group the remaining occurrences according to the broad semantic roles agent/contra-agent *(agens/patiens).*

šadday as agent *(agens).* Like Elihu (see above), Bildad (8:3) rejects any charge that *šadday* has perverted justice. By contrast, Job complains that God does not keep times for those who know him (24:1).[157] In this context *šadday* terrifies Job (23:16; *bhl* hiphil). Job 6:4 and 21:20 use the fixed language of drinking the divine wrath/poison *(ḥēmâ)* of *šadday,* with 6:4 combining the metaphor with that of Shadday's (poison) arrows.[158] The metaphor is engaged contrastively; in the developed form in 6:4, it describes Job's own situation over against *šadday,* in 21:20 the repayment (v. 19) of the wicked. According to 35:13, *šadday* cannot be provoked to intervene in times of need because he does not hear the lament about the violence and arrogance of evildoers; judgment is his alone.[159]

šadday as contra-agent *(patiens).* Job 6:14 is the only passage associating *yirʾâ* with

153. On possible redactional-historical considerations, see ibid., 173, 429-30.

154. See Fohrer, *Hiob,* 336.

155. See Mende, 169-70.

156. Ibid., 162-63, 182-84.

157. See Fohrer, *Hiob,* 371.

158. → חמה *ḥēmâ (chēmāh),* IV, 464-65; cf. G. Sauer, "חֵמָה *ḥēmâ* excitement," *TLOT,* I, 435-36; concerning the motif association with Resheph, the *bʿl ḥṣ* (cf. H. Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East* [Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1973], 137), against the background of 5:7, cf. Habel, *Job,* 145; Fohrer, *Hiob,* 148-49.

159. On contemporary historical considerations, see Mende, 430.

(ṣᵉḇāʼôṯ-ṣbʼ),[167] though the element of punishment and judgment can also be observed in other passages. Within the context of the prophetic corpus, Isa. 13:6 and Joel 1:15 stand in a complementary relationship to one another. Isa. 13:6 refers to judgment upon the nations (cf. v. 5), while Joel 1:15 refers to Jerusalem-Judah.[168] Scribal or learned interest in establishing more broadly arcing references and correspondences may have played an important role in the use of the DN *šadday* in late texts (cf. the use of the rare lexeme *šph* in Isa. 13:2 and the supplement in Nu. 23:3,[169] the stylization of Isa. 13:1ff., and the third and fourth oracles of Balaam as a "vision" and the thematic kinship as an "oracle of the nations"; note also the proximity to Ps. 68:12-15[11-14]).

Ezk. 1:24 and 10:5 use the divine name in a completely different way than do Isaiah and Joel. Ezk. 10:5 is part of an expansion stratum drawing on and transforming material from ch. 1; in 1:24 the combination *kᵉqôl-šadday* (not in LXX) is a late gloss presupposing the expansion of ch. 10.[170] Ezk. 10:5 is the only occurrence of the long form outside the Pentateuch; until the relationship between P and the redactional stages of Ezekiel has been clarified in greater detail, one can only surmise that the transmission of this form took place by way of the "priestly circle of Ezekiel's disciples," though nothing militates against this assumption. By contrast, it is indeed striking that the short form is used in the gloss in 1:24, which is dependent on 10:5. Was the long form customary only in a certain (Priestly) circle of tradition and/or only during a tightly circumscribed period? The divine name is the *nomen rectum* in a construct expression with *qôl* in a comparison. According to 10:5, the sound *(qôl)* of the wings of the cherubim of the divine throne-vehicle was like the voice *(qôl)* of *ʼēl šadday* "when he speaks." "This קול אל שׁדי can be understood as thunder in the sense of the קול יהוה of Ps 29:3ff, which is connected there also with the אל הכבוד."[171] Presumably the "noisy, destructive movement (echoing the Hebrew שׁדד) must be heard in the name."[172] The addendum in 1:24 adds to the comparison of the rushing of the wings of "living creatures" with the rushing of mighty waters *(kᵉqôl mayim rabbîm)* the expression *kᵉqôl-šadday* borrowed from 10:5 (the comparison with the sound of the army belongs to a subsequent interpretation that intensifies the description[173]).

In Ps. 68, whose text and content are both problematical,[174] v. 15(14) concludes the series of miraculous divine deeds (cf. vv. 8ff.[7ff.]) during the exodus of the people from Egypt to Canaan, and more specifically concludes the subsection vv. 12ff. The DNs *ʼᵃḏōnāy* (v. 12[11]) and *šadday* (v. 15[14]) constitute an inclusio. Drawing espe-

---

167. Personal communication from B. Zapff.

168. On the macrostructural references, see E. Bosshard, "Beobachtungen zum Zwölfprophetenbuch," *BN* 40 (1987) 31-32, 37-42.

169. On *šadday* in Numbers, see 2.a above.

170. On literary and redaction criticism, cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 88, 105-6, 254-55; C. B. Houk, "The Final Redaction of Ezekiel 10," *JBL* 90 (1971) 42-54; O. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst. SBS* 84/85 (1977), 140, 272.

171. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 255 n. 84.

172. Ibid.; cf. B. Kedar-Kopfstein, → "קוֹל *qôl,*" XII, 586-88.

173. See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 88, 105-6.

174. On the status of scholarship, cf. M. E. Tate, *Psalms 51–100. WBC* 20 (1990), 170-75.

proximity to Job 5:17-27 (also to Prov. 3:13-26); the adoption of the DN *šadday* may have been prompted also by Job 5:17. The development of the protective function associated with *šadday* may also resonate with a secondary connection with *šēḏ,* "demon."

The divine name occurs twice in Ruth 1:20-21, albeit not at the narrative level (cf. P texts and Job), but rather in an artistically stylized discourse in which Naomi interprets her fate before the Bethlehemite women. The DNs *šadday* and *yhwh* occur once each in one of the two discourse sections, which are introduced in parallel fashion (v. 20a, vetitive: "call me no longer"; v. 21b, rhetorical question: "why call me?"). The names are chiastically placed: vv. 20,21a *šadday-yhwh* (v. 21a follows v. 20 as explicative asyndeton); v. 21b *yhwh-šadday* (in syndetically structured parallel statements). The syntactical structure and content of the marginal statements about *šadday* are once again accommodated to one another: *hēmar šadday lî meʾōḏ-wešadday hēraʿ lî.* On the one hand, this poetic structuring leaves no doubt about the identity of *šadday* and *yhwh;* on the other hand, it emphasizes in the DN *šadday,* commensurate with its use in Job, the "omnipotence and unfathomable nature of the 'bitter' results of God's activity to which Naomi, like, Job, finds herself exposed."[186] The restriction of the use of the divine name to Naomi's discourse reveals the interpretive theological function that makes the assumption of an archaizing meaning less plausible[187] (a different situation obtains in Job with its more broadly dispersed use). In the context of the first part of the book of Ruth (1:1-22), Naomi's fourth and final discourse (1:20-21) picks up the theological "allusion" of her second discourse in vv. 1-13 (here v. 13bβ: "because the hand of Yahweh has turned against me") and develops it in connection with the key word *mrr* (similarly adopted from v. 13). It is noteworthy that in Ruth, just as in Nu. 24 and Job, *šadday* is used in connection with events taking place in Transjordan (Moab), a situation possibly reflecting knowledge of the spread of the divine name into this region as well as the compulsion — one self-evident from the perspective of Judah — to identify this deity with *yhwh* within the framework of postexilic monotheism.[188]

d. *Personal Names.* The name *šadday* occurs as a theophoric element in the two nominal sentence PNs *ʿammîšadday* (Nu. 1:12; 2:25; 7:66,71; in 10:25 as *ʿammî šadday*) and *ṣûrîšadday* (1:6; 7:36,41; in 2:12 and 10:19 as *ṣûrî šadday*).[189] Here *ʿammîšadday,* "my uncle/relative is *šadday,*" is the father of Ahiezer, head of a *bêṯ-ʾāḇ* and a → נשׂיא *nāśîʾ* ("leader") in Dan, whereas *ṣûrîšadday* is the father of Shelumiel, head of a *bêṯ-ʾāḇ* and a *nāśîʾ* in Simeon. Nu. 1:16 also introduces them as "ones chosen from the congregation" and as "heads of the divisions of Israel." The PN *šeḏêʾûr* (1:5; 2:10; 7:30,35; 10:18) is generally traced back to *šaddayʾûr* or *šaddayʾôr,* "*šadday* shines/gives light"[190] (but cf. LXX *Sediour*[191]). These names appear in the list of the "heads of the ancestral houses" in 1:4ff. and in the texts dependent on this list, chs. 2

186. E. Zenger, *Das Buch Ruth. ZBK* 8 (1986), 43.
187. See Weippert, *TLOT,* III, 1310.
188. On the postexilic dating and background of the Ruth novella, see Zenger, *Ruth,* 26-28.
189. On this whole complex, cf. *IPN;* Zadok.
190. *HAL,* IV, 1422b; Weippert, *TLOT,* III, 1304-5.
191. Vorländer, 218.

(camp organization); 7 (offerings on the day of the sanctuary dedication); 10 (organization of the departing people). All these passages belong to P(S) contexts (cf. the significance of the divine name in P), which together with the use of the name *šadday* precisely in connection with the tribes that were the first to vanish without a trace and about which the compiler thus was least able to supply "authentic" information[192] suggest that they represent a secondary, "artificial" construction of the list and thus should not be accorded an early dating.[193] The lineage of Judith in Jdt. 8:1 mentions a certain (Gk.) *Sarasadai* as a son of Israel or of Simeon; the corresponding Hebrew name is unknown.[194] Variants include *Sarisadai* (Symmachus) and *Salasadai* (Aquila).

3. *Summary*. All the attempts to assess the usefulness of the DN *šadday* in reconstructing the Israelite religion during the pre-state period are based on an early dating of several different passages (Gen. 49:25 [possibly 43:14]; Nu. 24:4,16; Ps. 68:15[14]; 91:1). Advocates of an early dating must deal with the observation that although this divine name was already familiar in Israel during a very early period, its use then completely receded for about five hundred years (!), the name then reemerging during the exile and becoming common again especially during the postexilic period.[195] The assumption of an unexplainable lacuna of centuries within tradition disappears when one recognizes that the divine name was not picked up before the exile and that more recent scholarship accords a late date to the disputed passages. Nor is the variously attested juxtaposition of *šadday* and *'elyôn* by way of a postulated "Jerusalem cultic tradition" of use in reconstructing the beginnings of Israelite religion.[196] It is likely that "those seeking information about the religion of pre-state Israel will probably have to do without *'ēl šadday*."[197] Hence if the determinative frame of reference for the interpretation of the use of the DN *šadday* in OT texts is the theoretical monotheism of the (exilic-)postexilic period, then the semantic distinction regarding the meaning and reference of a sign allows one to say that *šadday* always means the "one God of Israel." With the aid of this name and especially in connection with secondary etymological "interpretations," various semantic nuances can be expressed, including God as the "bestower of blessings," the "vehement one," etc. Through this name, aspects of the unfathomable, alien, and threatening can be integrated into the concept of God. Beyond these considerations, this name — which compared to the DN *yhwh* occurs relatively infrequently — also serves as a "signal" within larger literary contexts of reference. Its explicit

192. Knauf, *BN* 16 (1981) 25.

193. So G. E. Mendenhall, "The Census Lists of Numbers 1 and 26," *JBL* 77 (1958) 52-66; Noth, *Numbers*, 17-20; Budd, *Numbers*, 3-6. Cf. Köckert, 80-81; D. Kellermann, *Die Priesterschrift von Num 1,1 bis 10,10. BZAW* 120 (1970), 155-59.

194. See M. Weippert, *TLOT*, III, 1305; E. Zenger, *Das Buch Judit. JSHRZ* I/6 (1981), 485-86.

195. Cf., e.g., *HAL*, IV, 1421-22; M. Weippert, *TLOT*, III, 1309; Müller, "Gott"; D. N. Freedman; Cross; Rost; and many others; critical voices already include W. H. Schmidt, *The Faith of the OT: A History* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1983), 20-21.

196. See Niehr, 167-97.

197. Knauf, *BN* 16 (1981) 26; cf. Köckert, 301-3.

historical-theological association with the patriarchal period (Ex. 6:3) also makes it possible for this name to serve archaizing purposes (Job).

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX renders the DN *šadday* with a multiplicity of expressions.[198] In Genesis and Exodus it renders the long form as *ho theós* + personal pronoun (variously accommodated to the discursive situation). The translation of *'ēl šadday* in the Pentateuch shows "that שדי was understood as a term expressing a relationship between God and human beings. The question is whether Aram. דִּי is not exerting some influence here, which 'as a relational particle serves to circumscribe the genitive relationship.' The problem is that Heb. -שֶׁ is disruptive. Hence a philologically exact derivation of the LXX rendering does not seem possible, though one must at least concede that the meaning of the translations does excellently fit the various contexts; the issue is always God's nearness, something the LXX underscores."[199] In Ezk. 10:5 the LXX transcribes the name as *theós Saddai.* The short form in Nu. 24 and Isa. 13 is rendered as *(ho) theós* (in the related passage Joel 1:15, the reference to God is lost). The two occurrences in Ps. 68 and 91 are translated similarly *(ho epouránios; ho theós toú ouranoú).* Ruth 1:20-21 picks up the learned, "philological" understanding that analyzes the Hebrew expression as the elements *še + day* and renders *ho hikanós* ("the sufficient one").[200] The translation of the divine name in Job is inconsistent (cf. Bertram's observations regarding the supposed translation principles). Most of the passages read *(ho) pantokrátōr,* frequently also *(ho) kýrios;* in one instance the two names are combined, and in one the name is circumscribed with *ho pánta poiḗsas.* The three occurrences of *hikanós* in Job are asterisked. Hence the LXX does not adopt the etymologizing uses, and prefers to replace the divine name with familiar divine designations. The rendering of the divine name as *pantokrátōr,* which in the context of Hellenism underscored the universalistic conception of OT faith in God, had considerable theological repercussions.[201] Later Greek translations render *šadday* as *hikanós.*[202]

2. *Qumran.* In Qumran the divine name occurs in its short form in 4Q511 8, 6; 116, 3; both texts are severely corrupt. The first exhibits an affinity with Ps. 91:1 *(bstr).* Other occurrences are found only in citations of OT texts, e.g., 4Q175 11 (Nu. 24:16); 11QApPs[a] 5, 3 (Ps. 91:1).[203] By contrast, 11QtgJob renders the DN *šadday* as *'lh'* (6:1 [Job 22:3]); 7:3 [Job 22:17]), *mr'* (24:4-5,7 [Job 34:10,12]; 26:8 [Job 35:13]), or otherwise circumscribes it (cf. 11:4 [Job 27:13]).

Steins

---

198. See the helpful synopsis with information concerning the other versions in Zorell, "Gottesname," 216-17.

199. Rösel, 374.

200. See Reiss; see below.

201. See Bertram, *WO* 2 (1954/59) 511-13; W. Michaelis, "κράτος κτλ.," *TDNT,* III, 914-15.

202. See the thorough discussion in Bertram, *ZAW* 70 (1958) 20-31; K. H. Rengstorf, "ἱκανός," *TDNT,* III, 293-96.

203. Cf. J. P. M. van der Ploeg, "Le psaume XCI dans une recension de Qumran," *RB* 72 (1965) 210-17; O. Eissfeldt, "Eine Qumran-Textform des 91. Psalms," *KlSchr* V (1973), 45-49.

commissioned with assessing the people (Jer. 6:27), is confronted with God's grievous accusations against the people. The metaphor of someone who refines iron illustrates that the purification process goes on "in vain" (*laššāwʼ*, v. 29; cf. "useless"[8]). God's reaction to these findings is to reject the people.

In a symbolic act Ezekiel is to announce that Nebuchadnezzar will determine by lots (*qsm qesem,* Ezk. 21:26[21]; NRSV "divination") which of two paths to use for his Jerusalem campaign. The Jerusalemites do not take seriously this Babylonian divination (*qᵉsōm,* v. 28[23]), viewing it instead as ineffective *(šāwʼ).*[9] Because Jerusalem had bound itself by incessant promises, the Babylonians will punish their culpable *(ʻāwôn)* breach of word.

When a *rāšāʻ* runs stubbornly against God *(ʼēl)* (Job 15:26), neither his houses nor his possessions can endure (vv. 28-29). The culmination of this description of failure (v. 31) uses *šāwʼ* twice. As an amplification, v. 31a (cf. *BHS*) further specifies *šāwʼ* with references to error and aimlessness (*tʻh* niphal ptcp.). If v. 31 does indeed constitute a gloss,[10] it now shows quite well how *šāwʼ* can function interpretively; the word choice presupposes that the meaning is so appropriate that the redactor can use it for additional precision. The warning is against depending on (*ʼmn* hiphil) erroneous *šāwʼ*. In v. 31b *šāwʼ* renders the previously added dimension of deception into a single word: "fraud" or "deception"[11] is what one can (expect to) gain; i.e., it does not exist. For Job (7:1-2), life is hard service (Job uses *ṣāḇāʼ* only pejoratively [10:17; 14:14]), occasional work for hire (according to Mal. 3:5, the *śāḵîr* is included among the oppressed groups), and subjugation (wisdom texts view this as the most burdensome aspect of the life of an *ʻeḇeḏ;* Job 3:19; 19:16; Prov. 29:19,21; Eccl. 10:7). Hence certain times[12] (v. 3) become gloomy, and the night (*laylâ,* v. 3), which is also viewed as a time of brooding and nightmares (4:13; 20:8; 30:17; 33:15-16), can become a burden. The parallel to *šāwʼ*, namely, *ʻāmāl,* shows that "affliction, or rather . . . misery . . is part of the fundamental human condition."[13] In this context, *šāwʼ* refers to that element of hopelessness and deception ("frustration"[14]) that during the anxious night ineluctably approaches as that particular misery that has become an existential constant.

Even though the oppressed cry out for help (Job 35:9,12), they do not turn directly to God (v. 10). Nor, because of the cry of the evildoers (*rāʻîm,* v. 12), does God answer their cry in such cases *(ṣʻq)*. Although this line of thinking is continued, it is first interrupted by another cry, *ʼaḵ-šāwʼ* (v. 13). The appeal for help is doubtless ineffective

8. J. Bright, *Jeremiah. AB* 21 (1965), 47.

9. A different view is taken by H. Brandenburg, *Hesekiel* (Giessen, ³1963), 142: "swindle, fraud."

10. So G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 264; M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* 15 (1965), 113; F. Hesse, *Hiob. ZBK* XIV (1977), 107 n. 109; Gordis, 166; cf. by contrast, A. Weiser, *Das Buch Hiob. ATD* 13 (1951, ⁷1980), 118; H. Gross, *Ijob. NEB* 13 (1986), 61.

11. F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (⁴1983), 234-35, adduces good reasons why Mowinckel's proposed "magical aids" (p. 55) does not fit the meaning.

12. Gordis, 79, correctly understands *yarḥê (šāwʼ)* thus.

13. B. Otzen, → עמל *ʻāmāl,* XI, 199.

14. N. H. Tur Sinai, *The Book of Job* (Eng. trans., Jerusalem, 1967), 132.

merates those things he has avoided in order to show that he is worthy of that trust. This enumeration includes groups of people he has avoided and whom he qualifies more specifically as *mᵉṯê šāw'* or *na'ᵃlāmîm*. The *na'ᵃlāmîm* (v. 4) refers to "a group of people from whom the psalmist, avowing his innocence, wishes to dissociate himself; they are 'those who conceal themselves, i.e., insidiously, craftily,' sinister figures who act in secret, avoiding the light of day."[19] Here *šāw'* occupies the first position and as such functions as the predominant proof term. The explication by *'lm* and the proximity to *mᵉrē'îm* and *rᵉšā'îm* (v. 5) show that *šāw'* refers to what is deceitful or subversively false. According to N. Lohfink, a survey of Ps. 24–26 shows that *šāw'* probably refers to foreign gods.[20]

While confessing sin, the petitioner pleads for healing (Ps. 41:5[4]). His adversaries come at him with evil (*ra';* v. 6 [5]) and hope for his death (*mûṯ*) and ruin (*'bd*). This drastic situation includes those who come to him hypocritically as described in v. 7(6). When they come to see how he is doing, their hearts are already gathering mischief and falsehood against him; and when they leave him, they "go out, they tell it abroad." The stylistically parallel sentence continues substantively: "(Thus) do their hearts gather mischief (*'āwen*)." Although the following verses do imply that *šāw'* (v. 7[6]) includes the possibility of setting a cycle of misfortune into motion, they do not allow the conclusion that the reference is to magical practices.[21]

The desire to fathom God's depths reveals the difference between human beings and God (Job 11:7-9). Within the framework of the argumentation (*kî*), the author juxtaposes the human being in moral antithesis to God, who knows the *mᵉṯê šāw'* and sees through *'āwen* (v. 11). As in Ps. 41:7(6), *šāw'* refers to what is deceptive and subversively false ("dissemblers"; "false without any effort"; "evil, bad, and worthless"[22]), which, as in the case of the psalm, *'āwen* defines more specifically as deceptive evil.

The petitioner in Ps. 144 entreats Yahweh to intervene (vv. 5-6) against and rescue him from (v. 7) his adversaries (*bᵉnê nēḵar* according to v. 7c). In v. 8b *yᵉmîn šeqer* constitutes the parallel to *šāw'* (v. 8a; v. 8 and v. 11 exhibit the same wording, making it difficult to determine whether v. 8 or v. 11b is secondary, is supposed to be a refrain, or represents a determinative structural element[23]). "Power" is the figurative meaning of *yāmîn*.[24] The expression *yᵉmîn šeqer* thus refers to false, deceptive power. Since this

---

19. C. Locher, → עלם *'ālam*, XI, 151, also citing *HAL*, II, 834.

20. "Einige Beobachtungen zu Psalm 26," *Ein Gott, eine Offenbarung. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese, Theologie und Spiritualität. FS N. Füglister* (Würzburg, 1991), 189-204, here 193 n. 23, 204; so also Dahood, *Psalms 1–50*, 162; G. Ravasi, *Il libro dei salmi*, I (Bologna, ³1986), 489.

21. So S. Mowinckel, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (2 vols.; Eng. trans., New York, 1962), I, 6.

22. See, respectively, S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *Job. ICC* XIV/2 (1921), 108; H. H. Rowley, *Job. NCBC* (1980), 89; Fohrer, *Hiob*, 228.

23. See, respectively, A. Weiser, *Psalms. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), in loc.; J. W. Rogerson and J. W. McKay, *Psalms. CBC* (3 vols.; New York, 1977), III, 173; G. Ravasi, *Il libro dei salmi*, III (Bologna, ³1986), 898ff.

24. → ימין *yāmîn*, VI, 101.

combination is interpreting *šāw'*, the latter term in its turn refers to that which is deceptive, presumably with a destructive semantic nuance (cf. the cry for rescue); an element of opposition to God also resonates in the term.

Job knows that the heritage of evildoers is calamity and disaster (31:3). This heritage would befall Job, too, if it were true that *hālaktî 'im-šāw'* (v. 5) or *tahaš 'al-mirmâ raglî*. Since all the passages in which the vb. *hlk 'im* occurs attest a personal object, *šāw'* in 31:5 probably also refers to a (figuratively) personified entity, as it were personified deception,[25] something developed in the par. *mirmâ*, which refers to underhanded deceit (cf. Ps. 24:4).

3. *Juridical Use.* In juridical contexts *šāw'* involves public falsehood, especially that of witnesses. In Ex. 23:1 *šēma' šāw'* substantively parallels *'ēd ḥāmās*, the latter being associated with the *rāšā'*. Contextually the reference is to the perversion of justice in which someone joins a majority representing wrongdoing (cf. the intensive pl. *rā'ōt*). The association of *šāw'* in the narrower context with *ḥāmās* (cf. Dt. 19:16; Ps. 35:11) shows that it is here accompanied by something extremely negative, even life-threatening. Its content here is "falsehood, lies," and, in their wake, ruin.

One of the central themes of the Decalog is the function of witnesses (Dt. 5:20). The prohibition against answering as an *'ēd šāw'* (cf. *'ēd šeqer*, Ex. 20:16 [*šāw'* according to Pap. Nash]; Ps. 27:12; Prov. 6:19; 14:5; 25:18; *šᵉqārîm*, Prov. 12:17; 19:5,9; *kᵉzābîm*, 21:28) can be understood only as the antithesis of a "truthful witness" (*'ēd ᵉmet*, 14:25; Jer. 42:5; *'ēd ᵉmûnîm*, Prov. 14:5). No persuasive arguments can be adduced supporting a difference in meaning between *'ēd šāw'* and *'ēd šeqer*, contra the assertion that *šāw'* emphasizes more the ethical qualification of the witness.[26]

Isa. 59:2-5 enumerates everything separating the people from Yahweh. The direct parallel to *šāw'* in v. 4 is *tōhû*, a word equated with nonbeing *('ayin)*, *hebel* (49:4), or *rûaḥ* with the meaning "nothingness" (41:29), providing an incisively pejorative accent.[27] Here *šeqer* (v. 3) and *šāw'* are closely related in that both words are directly associated with *dibber*. The reference is to falsehood uttered in a public proceeding, as confirmed by the antithetical poles of *ṣedeq* and *ᵉmûnâ*, which prove themselves in court *(špṭ)*.

4. *Prophetic Use.* From the exilic period *šāw'* was used in a clearly fixed expression in connection with qualifying prophetic (or similar) phenomena that were to be rejected. Because authentic words of prophecy were to be fulfilled only later, Ezekiel had to contend with pseudoprophets, who are associated with *ḥᵃzôn šāw'* and, parallel, *miqsam ḥālāq* (Ezk. 12:24).[28] Whereas *ḥāzôn* is attributed to both true and false proph-

---

25. See Fohrer, *Hiob*, 433.

26. So also Sawyer, 1310-11. Cf. J. J. Stamm, *Der Dekalog im Lichte der neueren Forschung* (Bern, ²1962), 59-60; Klopfenstein, 18-21.

27. See S. Schwertner, "אַיִן *'ayin* nothing," *TLOT*, I, 96; R. Albertz and C. Westermann, "רוּחַ *rûaḥ* spirit," *TLOT*, III, 1205.

28. Viewed — probably incorrectly — as an addendum by G. Fohrer, *Ezechiel. HAT* I/13 (²1955), 66-67; K. W. Carley, *Ezekiel. CBC* (1974), 79.

ogy does point to a negative assessment and to the tension arising with faith in Yahweh. The empty character of such revelation is underscored in that the adversaries are described as *rᵉšā'îm* whose "time of final punishment" (so NRSV) *('āwôn)* has come.

No life can flourish without rain, or without trust in Yahweh (Zech. 10:1). People did, however, turn to the *tᵉrāpîm* and the *qôsᵉmîm.* The *tᵉrāpîm* appear in contexts mentioning either a foreign deity or something associated with such a deity.[33] The *qôsᵉmîm* convey the revelation of foreign gods (cf. Ezk. 21:34[29]). Dreams are also mentioned of the sort regularly associated both with Yahweh's own revelatory events (Nu. 12:6; Joel 3:1) and with those of foreign deities (Dt. 13:6[5]; Jer. 23:25ff.). The association of *qôsᵉmîm* and *ḥᵃlōmôṯ* with false prophecy also occurs in Jer. 27:9; 29:8. The dream is specified more closely by *šāw',* thereby emphasizing the falsehood as well as that particular characteristic of soothsayers' dreams that leads to ruin (*'āwen,* v. 10a; Zech. 10:2). The religious scruple is underscored by the par. *heḇel,* which (instrumental obj., as in Job 21:34) can mean or at least allude to a "foreign deity" (cf. the discussion of Jon. 2:9[8] below) in the sense "they 'give consolation' with the aid of the 'breath/appearance of foreign deities.'"

Lam. 2:14a (cf. the proximity to Ezk. 22:28; also 13:6; 21:34[29]) addresses the theme of being led astray by prophetic visions. Here *šāw'* refers to what is false and deceptive.[34] The parallel reference to whitewashing *(tāpēl)* points out that the disaster indicated by *šāw'* could exert its full effects only if concealed. Lam. 2:14 juxtaposes *maśśā'ôṯ šāw'* and *maddûḥîm.* Because *maśśā'* largely occurs in prophetic oracles of disaster, connotations involving burdens and tribulations are unmistakable.[35] The assessment of these visions as *šāw'* shows that they were viewed as "false and deceptive" ones leading to burdensome tribulation. The hapax legomenon *maddûḥîm* (from *ndḥ,* "lead astray, mislead") additionally interprets the deceptive sayings as misleading.

5. *Cult Criticism.* The term *šāw'* also occurs in connection with prophecies critical of the cult. Isa. 1:10-15 raises its criticism of the cult because those who present its sacrifices are themselves degenerate. The first two rejected sacrifices are qualified negatively; *minḥaṯ šāw'* parallels *qᵉṭōreṯ tô'ēḇâ.* The ineffective and deceptive nature *(šāw')* is explicated more closely by the reference to "abominations"[36] in the religious sphere (cf. Dt. 12:31; 18:9,12; Isa. 41:24; 44:19; Jer. 32:35; 44:21-22; Ezk. 5:9; 16:47,50). In this context *šāw'* refers to the kind of inner falseness that does not even respect sacrifices.

According to Hos. 12:9-12(8-11), the reproach against Ephraim is that the people trace its own wealth back to Canaanite gods. Now, however, it is destroyed with the help of prophets, the concrete occasion being the sacrifices in Gilead and Gilgal. Verse 12(11) is structured in the rhythm of reproach and consequences. The parallelism with

33. Cf. H. D. Preuss, *Die Verspottung fremder Religionen im AT. BWANT* 92 (1971), 58-60; K. Seybold, "תְּרָפִים *tᵉrāpîm* idol(s)," *TLOT,* III, 1433-34.

34. See H.-J. Kraus, *Threni. BK* XX (³1968), 46.

35. See in this regard also D. H. Müller, *Komposition und Strophenbau. BSt* III (1907), 24.

36. → תועבה *tô'ēḇâ;* cf. E. Gerstenberger, "תעב *t'b* pi. to abhor," *TLOT,* III, 1428-31.

M. Dahood reads *'ārîḵ* ("raised"), though this reading is possible only in connection with his otherwise extensive emendations.[49] Influenced by the LXX and Vg. *(in cogitatione),* L. Jacquet assumes the reading *rē'eyḵā* = "your thoughts" (hence from *rēa'* III).[50] The frequently proposed emendation *'āleyḵā* runs contrary to *nś'*, which exhibits neither an intransitive nor a reflexive meaning.[51] Because *nś'* requires a direct object, *šimeḵā* has been variously proposed following Ex. 20:7; nothing in the text, however, supports this emendation.[52] The most likely solution seems to be the term *'dyk,* "your witnesses," attested in a few mss.[53]

Ps. 139:20 describes how the wicked pervert the association with God: "they speak of/refer to you [Yahweh] as a ruse [*mezimmâ;* more strongly: 'malicious'], they raised/made your witnesses/the witnesses for you into a fraud [*šāw'*, v. 20; more strongly: 'treacherous']." Such talk perverts God's nature and dismisses his advocates as ineffective frauds. These presuppositions make the psalmist's vehement reaction comprehensible (vv. 21-22).

Jer. 2:28-31 turns aggressively against the worship of idols, which is interpreted as complaining/quarreling *(rîḇ)* and rebelling *pāša')* against Yahweh (v. 29). "To no effect" (*laššāw'*, v. 30; the customary rendering as "in vain, futilely" does not do full justice to the decisive disposition of the text) Yahweh struck down the Israelites, expecting his people to accept his correction; instead, they murdered his prophets without hesitation. Here the term *šāw'* functions to describe existential circumstances.

Yahweh has decided not to prevent the enemies from destroying the country (Jer. 4:29-30). In this context Israel's attempt to rescue itself — described metaphorically as a woman who beautifies herself in the hope that she might bewitch the men who have departed for a bloody war — is exposed as being "worthless, without effect" *(laššāw').* This secular metaphor underscores the futility of any notion that one might escape God and please one's enemies. Egypt's attempt to establish itself as a power in Mesopotamia is compared to a rising river (Jer. 46:7-8) that Yahweh will thwart such that the entire undertaking will lead to military catastrophe against which even "many medicines" offer no help; such accumulation has "no effect" (*laššāw'*, v. 11).

Mal. 3:14 presents the argumentation of the provocateurs, namely, that serving *'elōhîm* (genitive obj.) is merely *šāw'*, as underscored in that keeping his command brings neither success nor profit *(beṣa')* (this passage by no means attests the original neutrality of *beṣa'*[54]). The happy ones are those who apparently prosper, namely, those insolent ones and evildoers (*zēdîm* and *'ōśê riš'â,* v. 19[4:1]) who ply their wickedness

---

49. *Psalms III,* 297.

50. *Les Psaumes,* III, 610.

51. Contra, e.g., Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* in loc.; correctly B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen. KHC* XIV (²1922), 460.

52. "It lies graphically too far removed," H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 592; cf., e.g., W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Psalms* (London, 1962), 554; Kirkpatrick, *Psalms,* 791, suggests that it is to be supplied virtually.

53. See H. Herkenne, *Das Buch der Psalmen. HSAT* V/2 (1936), 435.

54. → בצע *bṣ'*, II, 207.

unscathed. Here *šāw'* is the antithesis of the expected success: failure or ineffectiveness.[55]

Viewed in isolation, the prohibition against raising *(nś')* the name of God "for *šāw'*" (Ex. 20:7[bis] = Dt. 5:11) is not particularly instructive for assessing the meaning of *šāw'*.[56] The text simply presupposes that the reader is familiar with the content of the word. The significance of the word emerges from several observations. The prohibition comes directly from Yahweh. The phrase occurs twice in the same verse and is identical in Ex. 20:7 and Dt. 5:11. In both cases the prohibition of *nś' laššāw'* is followed by a reason involving a sanction *(lō' yᵉnaqqeh)*. This element is otherwise attested in the Decalog only in connection with the prohibition against worshiping foreign gods. Because *lō' yᵉnaqqeh* remains undefined in all occurrences, however,[57] no content can be deduced from a comparison. The meaning and theological direction of the sentence change depending on the focus of *šāw'*. If the reference is to "ineffectiveness," then the incapacity to be effective is insinuated to Yahweh, the claim to be the sovereign (of Israel) collapses, and the result is then de facto disempowerment. If "fraud" (as an ethical qualification) is meant, then Yahweh is adduced as an external guarantor of correctness even though the facts of the matter then emerge differently. That is, Yahweh's name is then misused for certifying something fraudulent (cf. Ps. 24:4). If the dimension of "foreign deity" is included, the reference would attest the presence of syncretistic aberration. The proposal "perjury"[58] presupposes the unpersuasively attested equation of meaning between *nś' 'eṯ-šēm* and *šb'* niphal *bᵉšēm* (cf. Dt. 6:13; 10:20).

Jonah turns to God in his distress (Jon. 2:8[7]) to offer a sacrifice (v. 10[9]); he will not, however, serve others (*haḇlê šāw'*, v. 9[8]). Rarely does *heḇel* function as the *nomen regens*.[59] More specifically one can note that all the qualified plural occurrences refer to foreign deities; in Dt. 32:21 *hᵃḇālîm* parallels *lō'-'ēl;* cf. *(haššōmᵉrîm) haḇlê šāw'* in contrast to Yahweh (Ps. 31:7[6]). In Jon. 2:9(8) the speaker expects help on the basis of his prayer to Yahweh (*yᵉšû'â,* v. 10[9]); if one worships the *hᵃḇālîm,* one can expect no help. The foreign gods disqualified by *šāw'*[60] are viewed as ineffective.

Various ways of presenting entreaties for help in Ps. 31:2-6(1-5) culminate in a confession of trust in Yahweh: *yhwh 'ēl 'ᵉmeṯ*. Here one enters the sphere of theological argumentation. At the pragmatic textual level in v. 7(6), *yhwh* and *haḇlê šāw'* — foreign deities — constitute antitheses. Observations regarding the poetic structure already militate against the view of B. Duhm, who maintains that one "probably cannot

55. See K. Elliger, *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten II. ATD* 25 (⁷1975), 214.

56. E.g., even F. L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. OBO* 45 (1982), 247, does not ascribe any particular function to the word.

57. → נקה *nāqâ,* IX, 556-57.

58. See, among others, Veijola, 4, 8, 13.

59. → הבל *hebel (hebhel),* III, 314.

60. See, among others, L. C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah. NICOT* (1976), 218.

interpret *h^a^bālîm* here . . . as idols."[61] The petitioner confirms that he strictly rejects *(śn')* the adherents *(šōm^e^rîm)* of the foreign gods. By contrast he emphasizes that he trusts *(bṭḥ)* only in Yahweh. The term *šāw'* serves as a severe qualification of these foreign gods, who are described as "winds" and whose ineffective nature[62] is also emphasized. Hence it is quite logical that expressions of joy already commence with v. 8(7), since God is certain to deliver the petitioner from these enemies (suffix conjugation; v. 9[8]).

Just as there are constants in nature (Jer. 18:14), so also in faith. Here, however, Israel has done the unthinkable, namely, fallen away from and forgotten *(š^e^ḵēḥûnî)* Yahweh, as expressed by *laššāw' y^e^qaṭṭērû* (v. 15). Objects introduced by *l^e^* with *qṭr* are consistently personal, specifically those to whom sacrifices are offered,[63] namely, *lē'lōhîm ^'a^ḥērîm* (14 times), *labba'al* (2), *limleḵeṯ haššāmayim* (4), and *l^e^yhwh* (4). These unequivocal findings suggest that v. 15 also refers to a divine figure that in its own turn can be juxtaposed with Yahweh but at the same time is exposed by *šāw'* in all its worthlessness ("the worthless gods").[64]

IV. Sirach. The extant Hebrew text of Sirach uses *šw'* 5 times. Sir. 15:7a begins an enumeration of those whose bad behavior prevents their access to wisdom (14:20). The first to be mentioned include *mty šw'* (v. 7a), parallel *'nšy zdwn* (v. 7b), *lṣym* (v. 8a), and *'nšy kzb.* Here *šw'* is to be associated with what is false and fraudulent as an ethical qualification (cf. Job 11:11; Ps. 26:4). The same applies to *n'ry šw'* (16:1), parallel to *bny 'wlh,* who are juxtaposed with *'yn yr't yyy.* The qualification of the descendants suggests profound degeneracy far removed from God. Sir. 30:17 prefers death to a life of misery, and the underworld to chronic sickness. This verse is doubly attested in ms. B. In the first instance *ḥyy šw'* (a) occupies the same position as *ḥyym r'ym* (a′) and in parallel *k'b n'mn* (b) the same position as *k'b 'wmd* (b′). Here *šw'* exhibits the general meaning "bad" (the unusual word choice militates in favor of the originality of a and b over against a′ and b′[65]). Sir. 30:11g also uses *šw'* to qualify a bad worker *(pw'l);* the term *šwmr šw'* in the parallel stich (v. 11h) cannot be evaluated because of textual corruption.[66]

Sir. 15:20 (A) attests *ḥṭ', 'nšy kzb, 'wśh šw',* and *mglh swd.* The proximity to transgression and lies is clear, whereby the object function of *šw'* with the vb. *'śh* should be noted. The protocanonical version attests *'śh kzbym* (Prov. 23:5) and *'śh šqr* (2 S. 18:13; Jer. 6:13; 8:10), but never *'śh šw'* or any similar expression, showing that for Sirach the term refers not only to a quality, but also to the content itself (lies, falsehood), while maintaining the ethical connotations.

---

61. *Die Psalmen. KHC* XIV (²1922), 125.
62. See Delitzsch, *Psalms,* in loc.
63. Not so noted in → קטר *qṭr.*
64. J. Schreiner, *Jeremia 1–25,14. NEB* (1981), 115, among others.
65. A different position is taken by P. W. Skehan and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira. AB* 39 (1987), 379.
66. See F. V. Reiterer, "Die Stellung Ben Siras zur 'Arbeit,'" *FS N. Füglister,* 262.

V. 1. *LXX.* The LXX uses different words in its translations, including *ánomoi* (1 time), *átopa* (1), *metá geloiastṓn* (1), *kenós* (5), *eis kenón* (3), *mátaios* (17), *mataiótēs* (5), *mataíōs* (1), *(eis) mátēn* (6), *pseudḗs* (11).

2. *Qumran.* The term *šāw' (šāw, šāww)* is attested 7 times in Qumran. Although its use follows that in the protocanonical biblical books (as regards syntax and style as well as content), it does tend to focus on only the most negative meanings

In 1QpHab the prophet of lies (*maṭṭîp hakkāzāḇ,* 10:9) establishes an *'îr šāww* with blood *(bᵉḏāmîm)* and a congregation of deceit (*'ēḏâ bᵉšeqer,* l. 10). To that end he takes them into a service of deception (*ba'ᵃḇôḏaṯ šāww,* l. 11; *bᵉ[ma'ᵃ]śê šeqer,* l. 12). In initial position *šāw'* parallels *(bᵉ)šeqer;* both words function as qualifiers and speak of fraud or lies, implying the presence of destructive elements.

According to 1QH 2:21, *'ārîṣîm* are threatening the life of the author. Line 22 classifies these people as *sôḏ šāw'* and *'ᵃdaṯ bᵉlîya'al.* The term *šāw'* again stands in the initial position and refers here to "ruinous trouble," as *bᵉlîya'al* specifies more closely. The continuation follows effortlessly in that the *rᵉšā'îm* (l. 24) fall upon the petitioner like natural forces whose malevolence (*'ep'eh* and *šāw'* [perhaps a later insertion], v. 28) reaches up to the heavens. 1QH 6:5 follows substantively on 2:22 even though the context is only partially preserved: *'ᵃḏaṯ [šāw']* and *sôḏ ḥāmās.* The terms *šāw'* and *ḥāmās* explicate the ruinous wickedness of the hostile congregation. 1QH 7:34 *('ᵃḏaṯ šāw* par. *sôḏ na'ᵃlāmîm)* emphasizes the malevolent, misleading character of the rejected group.

Finally, 4Q184 1:2 maintains that the seductress is trying to plunge everyone together *(yḥd)* into ruin *(bšw).*

In 3Q15 1:13 *šw'* as a masculine form presumably belongs to → שׁוֹאָה *šô'â.*[67] The same probably applies to the place name *hšw'* (8:10,14), a necropolis also mentioned by Josephus *(byt-šw')* and identified with *'ēmeq hammeleḵ* (Gen. 14:17).[68]

Reiterer

67. See J. T. Miliik, *DJD,* III, 241.
68. See ibid., 241, 274.

שׁוּב *šûḇ;* שׁוּבָה *šûḇâ;* מְשׁוּבָה *mᵉšûḇâ;* תְּשׁוּבָה *tᵉšûḇâ*

Contents: I. Etymology and Basic Meaning. II. Ancient Near East: 1. Akkadian; 2. Amorite; 3. Ugaritic; 4. Proto-Sinaitic; 5. Hebrew Epigraphy; 6. Moabite; 7. Aramaic, Samaritan, Nabatean, Palmyrene; 8. Syriac, Mandaic; 9. Egyptian; 10. Phoenician-Punic; 11. South Semitic. III. OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Expressions; 3. Word Field; 4. Personal Names; 5. Ruth. IV. Secular Semantic Categories: 1. Qal; 2. Pilel/Polal; 3. Hiphil/Hophal; 4. Nouns. V. Theological Semantic Categories: 1. Qal; 2. Pilel/Polal; 3. Hiphil/Hophal; 4. Nouns. VI. Tetrateuch: 1. Pentateuchal Sources; 2. Joseph Story; 3. Legal Corpus. VII. Preexilic Prophets: 1. Amos; 2. Hosea; 3. Isaiah; 4. Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Obadiah; 5. Jeremiah; 6. Ezekiel; 7. Historical Roots of the Theme "Return" and Its Genre. VIII. Deuteronomy: 1. Theological Contexts; 2. "Return." IX. Deuteronomistic History: 1. *šwb mē'aḥ*ᵃ*rê yhwh;* 2. *šwb min/'el.* X. The Chronicler's History. XI. Exilic and Postexilic Prophets: 1. Deutero-Isaiah; 2. Trito-Isaiah; 3. Zechariah; 4. Malachi; 5. Joel; 6. Jonah. XII. Psalms. XIII. Wisdom: 1. Proverbs; 2. Job; 3. Sirach. XIV. Anthropological Expressions. XV. Ancient Versions: 1. LXX; 2. Vulgate; 3. Peshitta; 4. Targums. XVI. 1. Qumran; 2. Rabbinic Judaism.

šûḇ. A. Aḥuvia, "*'ywn bmšm'ym šl hšwrš šwb,*" *Leš* 39 (1974/75) 21-36; S. E. Balentine, "A Description of the Semantic Field of Hebrew Words for 'Hide,'" *VT* 30 (1980) 137-53, esp. 147-50; M. L. Barré, "The Meaning of *l' 'šybnw* in Amos 1:3–2:6," *JBL* 105 (1986) 611-31; J. Behm and E. Würthwein, "μετανοέω κτλ.," *TDNT,* IV, 980-1006; G. Bertram, "στρέφω," *TDNT,* VII, 714-29; W. A. M. Beuken, *Haggai-Sacharja 1–8. Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der frühnachexilischen Prophetie* (Assen, 1967), esp. 84-115; G. Braulik, "Gesetz als Evangelium. Rechtfertigung und Begnadigung nach der deuteronomischen Tora," *ZTK* 79 (1982) 127-60 = *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums. SBAB* 2 (1988), 123-60, esp. 151-60; H. Braun, "'Umkehr' in spätjüdisch-häretischer und in frühchristlicher Sicht," *ZTK* 50 (1953) 243-58; R. O. Coleman, "Repentance in the OT," *BI* 12 (1986) 30-31; S. Deck, *Die Gerichtsbotschaft Jesajas: Charakter und Begründung. FzB* 67 (1991), esp. 254-60; E. K. Dietrich, *Die Umkehr (Bekehrung und Busse) im AT und im Judentum bei besonderer Berücksichtigung der neutestamentlichen Zeit* (Stuttgart, 1936); M. Dijkstra, "Legal Irrevocability *(lō' yāšûb)* in Ezekiel 7:13," *JSOT* 43 (1989) 109-16; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the OT. OTL* (2 vols.; Eng. trans. 1961-67), esp. II, 465-74; H.-J. Fabry, *Die Wurzel ŠÛB in der Qumran-Literatur. Zur Semantik eines Grundbegriffes. BBB* 46 (1975); idem, "Umkehr und Metanoia als monastisches Ideal in der 'Mönchsgemeinde' von Qumran," *Erbe und Auftrag* 53 (1977) 163-80; idem, "Die Wurzel שׁוב in der Qumrânliteratur," in M. Delcort, ed., *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie, et son milieu. BETL* 46 (1978), 285-93; A. Feuillet, "Metanoia," in K. Rahner and A. Darlap, eds., *Sacramentum mundi: An Encyclopedia of Theology* (Eng. trans. 1969), IV, 16-23; J. Fichtner, "Die 'Umkehrung' in der prophetischen Botschaft," *TLZ* 78 (1953) 459-66 = *Gottes Weisheit. AzT* II/3 (1965), 44-51; G. Fohrer, "Umkehr und Erlösung beim Propheten Hosea," *TZ* 11 (1955) 161-85 = *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie [1949-1965]. BZAW* 99 (1967), 222-41; J. G. Gammie, "The Theology of Retribution in the Book of Deuteronomy," *CBQ* 32 (1970) 1-12; O. García de la Fuente, "Sobre la idea de contrición en el AT," *Sacra Pagina* 1 (1959) 559-79; J. Giblet, "Le sens de la conversion dans l'AT," *La Maison-Dieu* 90 (1967) 79-92; idem and A.-M. Denis, "Pénitence," *DBS,* VII, 628-87; D. S. Goldstein, "Teshuba. The Evolution of the Doctrines of Sin and Repentance

The Akkadian equivalent to Heb. *šwb* is the vb. *târu* < *tuārum*,[9] whose root recurs in Heb. *twr*, "go about, reconnoiter." It is difficult to determine whether there is also an etymological connection with *s/śwr*, "move away/off, deviate, fall away." In secular usage *târu* exhibits a remarkable concurrence with *šwb* ("return, turn, turn around, [fly] to and fro, return to an earlier condition, reestablish oneself, calm oneself, return [to dust], do something again"). Essential differences, however, emerge in theological usage in that *târu* never refers to a person's ethical-religious return to a deity, though *târu* can very well refer to the gracious turn of a deity toward a person. The turning of the deity toward a petitioner consists in the deity accepting that person's entreaty and turning its countenance toward the person again.[10] The petition for a vivifying and salvific "turning back" of the deity (*terrī kišādki*, "turn your neck") can be viewed as the equivalent of many OT formulations (cf. Ps. 6:5[Eng. 4]; 51:14[12]; 90:13; 132:10; Isa. 63:17).[11]

The term *târu* also occurs in legal texts with the meaning "come back to [i.e., contest] a contract" (cf. Sum. *gi₄.gi₄.dam* and Ezk. 7:13),[12] especially in connection with clauses involving the renunciation of a suit.

The term *târu* occurs in connection with Akkadian names in contexts involving petitions and praise for the renewed "turning" of a deity toward a person: *Tu-ra-am-ᵈDagan*, *ᵈŠamaš-tu-ra-am*, *I-túr-ilum*, etc.[13] Use of the verb in the factitive stems in constructing names also strongly resembles the incorporation of *šwb*.[14]

Akkadian uses this root to construct the substantival formatives *tayāru*, "compassion, mercy," *tayyāru*, "compassionate, merciful," and *tayyartu*, "return, turn" (said of gods) and "forgiveness."[15]

Finally, in *saḫāru* Akkadian attests a verb corresponding more closely especially to the theological semantic use of *šwb*,[16] though the notion of an ethical-theological turn (repentance) is not attested in Akkadian.

2. *Amorite.* Several Amorite personal names already attest the root *šwb* at the beginning of the 2nd millennium B.C.E. in the East Canaanite sphere, where one can observe the consistent replacement of Akk. *târu* by *šwb*: *Ya-šu-ub-AN*, *Šu-ub-na-AN*, etc.[17] Similar names are attested in Alalakh.[18]

---

9. *AHw*, III, 1332-36.

10. See *AOT*, 257-60, esp. l. 95.

11. Cf. L. Köhler, *OT Theology* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1957), 123-24; H. D. Preuss, *OT Theology*. *OTL* (2 vols.; Eng. trans. 1995), I, 150; also J. J. M. Roberts, *The Earliest Semitic Pantheon* (Baltimore, 1972), 18, 49.

12. Cf. H. Petschow, *Die neubabylonischen Kaufformulare. Leipziger rechtswissenschaftliche Studien* 118 (Leipzig, 1939); and the studies of M. San Nicolò; Dijkstra, 109-11.

13. J. J. Stamm, *AN*, 146-48, 168, 190, 339.

14. Ibid., 287-90, 320.

15. *AHw*, III, 1303-4.

16. *AHw*, II, 1005-8; → סחר *sāḥar*, X, 211-15.

17. *APNM*, 266.

18. Ibid., 69-70, 266; according to *APNM*, 270, names with *târu* are not Amorite.

3. *Ugaritic.* The root *ṯb* is widely attested in Ugaritic,[19] though the distinction from *yṯb,* "sit, set oneself," is not always easy to ascertain. The verb occurs both in the qal in the sense "return from/to, turn around, turn into oneself, turn to something," though also "proclaim, recite, repeat," as well as in the shaphel in the sense "answer, reimburse, report, etc.,"[20] and finally in several personal names. In this meaning *ṯb* often parallels *'ny*[21] or *hlk*[22] (cf. in this regard Isa. 35:9-10; Hos. 2:9[7]). One particularly frequent expression is *rgm ṯṯb,* "let a word return, answer," corresponding thus to the frequent Hebrew expression *hēšîḇ dāḇār.* Another rather frequent rubric is *wṯb l mspr,* "and let one cite once more."[23] The goddess Anat frequently uses the impv. *ṯb,* "give heed."[24] The passage in which Mot returns from the underworld to Baʿal's hiding place on Zaphon to reckon with the latter deserves special attention.[25] This "return" implies *in nuce* the idea of resurrection. Baʿal's "return" to his palace is identical with taking over world dominion.[26]

4. *Proto-Sinaitic.* The Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions from Serabit el-Khadem date to an extremely early stage of the southern Canaanite language (ca. 1800 B.C.E.).[27] Several inscriptions attest the letter sequence *ḏ ṯb 't ḏt bṯn mṯ,*[28] which Albright translates "I am one who has returned to the serpent goddess," suspecting that *ṯb* represents a euphemism for "die."[29] The root *šwb* can have a similar meaning in the OT (cf. Gen. 3:19; Job 34:15; Ps. 9:18[17]; 104:29). Albright later interpreted the inscription to mean "I am grateful toward the . . . ,"[30] finding in *ṯḇ* an adjective meaning "merciful > answering." R. F. Butin derives *ṯb* from *yṯb* and interprets it as "dwelling-place" or "sleeping-shelter."[31] Inscription 365A attests ?]*ṯṯbnm*[? in a votive inscription for Baʿalat(?), possibly a shaphel form in the sense of a petition or thanksgiving to the deity for restoration (of health).[32]

---

19. *WUS,* no. 2828; Whitaker, 628-29.

20. *UT,* no. 2661; *CML*², 160; S. Segert, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (Berkeley, 1984), 204.

21. *KTU* 1.3, IV, 65-66; 1.19, IV, 180-81; 1.20, B, 7-8; cf. M. J. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 300-301, no. 438.

22. *KTU* 1.17, VI, 42; 1.18, IV, 16-17.

23. E.g., *KTU* 1.4, V, 104 (cf. *ANET,* 134a), varied in 1.23, 56.

24. *KTU* 1.3, IV, 7 et passim; cf. also 1.17, VI, 42; *ANET,* 152a, l. 42.

25. *KTU* 1.6, VI, 12; *ANET,* 141b (vi, 12).

26. *KTU* 1.4, VII, 42; *ANET,* 135b, l. 42.

27. On the dating cf. B. Sass, *The Genesis of the Alphabet and Its Development in the Second Millennium B.C. ÄAT* 13 (1988), 135-56; a different view is taken by W. Diem, "Das Problem von ש im Althebräischen und die kanaanäische Lautverschiebung," *ZDMG* 124 (1974) 228, with W. F. Albright, *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and Their Decipherment. Harvard Theological Studies* 22 (1966), 12: between 1525 and 1475.

28. See texts (351,) 360, 361.

29. Albright, "The Early Alphabetic Inscriptions from Sinai and Their Decipherment," *BASOR* 110 (1948) 18-19.

30. *Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions,* 20, 25, 44.

31. "The Protosinaitic Inscriptions," *HTR* 25 (1932) 162, 186.

32. See Diem, *ZDMG* 124 (1974) 236.

5. *Hebrew Epigraphy.* Hebrew epigraphs attest *šwb* 5 times. *Šwb* occurs in the Lachish letters in the meaning "bring letters back = hand over a decree," and also in the sense of "answer" with the implication "give instructions."[33] An Arad ostracon[34] speaks about "returning" a report (cf. Gen. 37:14; Nu. 13:26; 1 S. 17:30; Isa. 41:28; Ezk. 9:11).[35] Ostracon 1 from Mesad Hashavyahu addresses personal property issues. The writer, petitioning for help, complains to his commander that his garment has been illegally confiscated: "It is true, I am innocent of any wrong; give back my garment" *(hšbn' 't bgdy; lhšb 't bgd 'bdk).*[36] This text involves either the regulations regarding the rights of the poor (cf. Ex. 22:25[26]; Lev. 5:23[6:4]; Dt. 24:13; 1 S. 12:3; Ezk. 18:7,12), forced labor,[38] or, more likely, the (perhaps overzealously implemented) compulsory dues for supporting the fortress of Meṣad Ḥashavyahu.[39]

6. *Moabite.* The two possible Moabite witnesses for *šb*[40] are vehemently disputed because the context allows ambivalent interpretations: "And Omri took possession of the whole land of Medeba, and he lived there *(wyšb bh)* in his days . . . *wyšbh kmš bymy*" (ll. 8-9). Within the context of the conquest report of the Moabite king, the concentration of *yšb* statements (ll. 8,10,19,31) suggests a similar one here, namely: "and in my days Kemosh lived there."[41] Because the graphic difference is unmistakable, however, and the assumption of haplography is unpersuasive, the interpretation of Holladay is still possible, "he [Kemosh] restored it"[42] (cf. "he returned"[43]), such that this statement might represent a theological interpretation of the reconquest by Mesha.[44]

A similar difficulty arises in l. 12: *w'šb mšm 't 'r'l dwdh.* If *'r'l* refers to a person, a derivation of the *w'šb* from *šbh,* "lead away captive," would make sense. If, however, *'r'l dwdh* refers to the altar of a god, the interpretation "and I brought back" is possible

---

33. Letters 5.6 (*KAI* 195.6), 9.4 (*KAI* 197.4).

34. No. 111.4; D. Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters. SBLSBS* 15 (1982), 65-67.

35. On the attendant problems see B. A. Levine, "Notes on a Hebrew Ostracon from Arad," *IEJ* 19 (1969) 49-51.

36. *KAI* 200.12, 13; cf. D. Conrad, *TUAT,* I, 249-50.

37. Cf. A. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébraïques I. Les ostraca. LAPO* 9 (1977), 266-67; F. Crüsemann, "Damit er dich segne in allem Tun deiner Hand (Dtn 14,29)," in L. and W. Schottroff, eds., *Mitarbeiter der Schöpfung* (Munich, 1983), 72-103.

38. S. Talmon, "The New Hebrew Letter from the Seventh Century B.C. in Historical Perspective," *BASOR* 176 (1964) 29-38.

39. So F. M. Cross, "Epigraphic Notes on Hebrew Documents of the Eighth-Sixth Centuries B.C. II," *BASOR* 165 (1962) 46; and M. Kleer and M. Kröger, "Das gepfändete Gewand," *BN* 61 (1992) 38-50; on this discussion see also M. Weippert, "Die Petition eines Erntearbeiters aus Mesad Hašvyahu und die Syntax althebräischer erzählender Prosa," *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte. FS R. Rendtorff* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1990), 449-66.

40. Mesha stela, *KAI* 181.8-9,12.

41. *KAI,* II, 168; H.-P. Müller, *TUAT,* I, 647.

42. Cf. Holladay, 10.

43. *DNSI,* II, 1115.

44. Cf. *TSSI,* I, 79.

("I brought back from there the altar of their *dwd*"[45]). Because of the unclear context, however, this solution is uncertain as well.

7. *Aramaic, Samaritan, Nabatean, Palmyrene.* Within the Aramaic sphere, *š/ṯwb* is richly attested during all periods and in all dialects.[46]

a. The root *šwb* occurs in the Old Aramaic inscriptions of Sefire in the peal as well as in the haphel.[47] Within the text of the 8th-century treaty between Barga'yah and Matti'el, *šwb* is already exhibiting a broad semantic spectrum. The inferior treaty partner is obligated to return escaped subjects to the sovereign (*hšb,* l. 6; ll. 2-3 express this delivery with *skr*). The hiphil of *šwb* is used similarly in Gen. 14:16 and 1 S. 30:19. The context of the Sefire treaty also implies, however, a semantic valence in *hšb* to lead the apostates back into their status of service and loyalty (an example of extrabiblical "covenantal usage"[48]). Within the framework of the existing treaty, the partners agree (l. 20) to respect existing property relationships and in the case of shifts mutually to return lawful possessions *(hn hšb zy ly 'hšb [zy lh]).*

The expression *wk't hšbw 'lhn šybt byt 'by* (l. 24) is of considerable historical interest. After portraying the temporary period of foreign rule, Barga'yah interprets the turn in fate as having been effected by the gods: "Now the gods have restored my patriarchal dynasty."[49] Although this translation fits the context, it does not do justice to the specific meaning of *šybh,* "(the) coming back,"[50] displacing it rather in favor of the composite meaning of the expression, the argumentation clearly being influenced by biblical *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ.*[51] Sefire III.24 allows one to maintain *bᵉšûḇ yhwh 'eṯ-šîḇaṯ-ṣîyôn* in Ps. 126:1 as an early form of orthography even though it has generally been assumed to be a result of scribal error. No derivation from *šbh* is indicated.[52]

The parallel l. 25 shows the results of the divinely effected turn in the family history: *[wrbh byt] 'by wšbt tl'ym l[brg'y]h,* "and the dynasty of my father has become great, and TL'YM [a city?] has . . . returned to Barga'yah." This sort of restitution of land possessions — expressed by *šwb* — is well attested in the OT (cf. Lev. 27:24; 1 S. 7:14; Ezk. 46:17). A similar situation, now as a causative, is found in l. 27 according to the reconstruction by A. Dupont-Sommer.[53]

---

45. Müller, *TUAT,* I, 648; cf. *KAI,* II, 169; *ANET,* 320; *AOT,* 441; *TSSI,* I, 76, 80.

46. See R. A. Brauner, "A Comparative Lexicon of Old Aramaic" (diss., Dropsie, 1974), 574-75; *LexLingAram,* 175-76.

47. *KAI* 224.6,20,24,25,27; *ANET,* 659-60.

48. See Holladay, 116-57.

49. *KAI,* II, 265; cf. J. C. Greenfield, "Stylistic Aspects of Sefire Treaty Inscriptions," *AcOr* 29 (1965) 4.

50. *WTM,* IV, 544.

51. → שְׁבוּת *šᵉḇûṯ.*

52. So E. Vogt, "Nova inscription aramaica saec. 8. s.C.," *Bibl* 39 (1958) 274; on the passage see A. M. Harman, "The Setting and Interpretation of Psalm 126," *Reformed Theological Review* 44 (1985) 74-80.

53. A. Dupont-Sommer, "Une inscription araméenne inédite de Sfiré," *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* 13 (1956) 36.

A treaty dating to ca. 635 B.C.E.[54] suggests that certain sanctions go into effect if one treaty partner turns against the other (*mn 'l mn yšb,* ll. 10-11).[55]

An Assyrian ostracon dating to ca. 660 B.C.E.[56] is written in a transitional dialect between Old and Imperial Aramaic. Here too the issue is the return (*htb,* l. 11) in connection with property rights, according to Hug the return of fugitive slaves.[57]

b. Few witnesses have been preserved in Imperial Aramaic. Among the documents published by G. R. Driver,[58] one contains several occurrences of *twb.* One line reads: *zy lqḥt kl' htbhb,* "and now absolutely replace all that you have taken." The form *htbhb* is constructed from the haphel imperative of *twb* + the qal imperative of *yhb.* This crasis is separated three lines later into *htb hblhm,* "that which you took by force you shall now absolutely replace." Here *htb* is not functioning as an auxiliary verb,[59] since the same letter uses the adj. *twb',* "again, anew," instead.[60]

c. Egyptian Aramaic attests several occurrences. Here *twb* means "return" to a business partner[61] and to a renewed "turning" of the king toward a petitioner.[62] One document providing insight into marital law in the Jewish colony Elephantine[63] is a marriage contract stipulating that in case the woman should ever sue for divorce, she is to "return to the scale" *(ttb 'l mwzn')* in order to weigh out a certain sum from her bridal money for her husband.[64]

In the haphel, *twb* refers to the return of deposited goods,[65] in one instance concerning the plundering of a temple in Thebes, which was attributed to the Jews and followed by a pogrom involving the plundering of Jewish homes in Elephantine. After the Persian governor intervened, the looters were sentenced with, among other things, having to return plundered goods *('tbw 'm 'l mryhm).*[66] One wisdom saying in Ahiqar advises, "Bend not thy bow and shoot not thine arrow at a righteous man, lest God come to his help and turn it back upon thee *(wyhtybnhy 'lyk)*"[67] (on the haphel form see Ezra

---

54. See P. Bordreuil, "Une tablette araméenne inédite de 635 av. J.-C. (Louvre, A.O.25.341)," *Sem* 23 (1973) 95-102.

55. Cf. V. Hug, *Altaramäische Grammatik der Texte des 7. und 6. Jh.v.Chr. Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient* 4 (1993), 25.

56. *KAI* 233.

57. Hug, 19-21.

58. *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1957), here 12.7,10.

59. So ibid., 83.

60. Cf. l. 11; on the form see Beyer, 722.

61. *AP* 45.5.

62. Ahiqar 65; cf. I. Kottsieper, *TUAT,* III, 346 [XIX 2]; cf. *ANET,* 428.

63. *AP* 15; cf. P. Grelot, *Documents araméens d'Égypte. LAPO* 5 (1972), 192-97, here ll. 23-24.

64. On the legal background see B. Porten, *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley, 1968), 252-55; on the meaning of the expression see J. J. Rabinowitz, "The Meaning of תתב על מוזנא in the Aramaic Papyri," *VT* 6 (1956) 104.

65. *AP* 20.7; 34.

66. *AP* 34.6; thus essentially according to Grelot, *Documents,* 396-98.

67. Ahiqar 126 (V 1); translation *ANET,* 429a; cf. Kottsieper, *TUAT,* III, 328; idem, *Die Sprache der Ahiqarsprücher. BZAW* 194 (1990), 15; concerning this passage and a possible com-

6:5; on the construction see 2 S. 16:8; Ps. 94:23). Here *htyb* refers to the divine initiative that sets the act-consequence nexus into motion and thus turns the consequences of the deed back on the perpetrator.

Finally, *twb* is also used adverbially to mean "again,"[68] whereby — as in the later *'pm* clause[69] — in a legal dispute the status quo ante is to be put into effect. Otherwise *twb* or *twb'* refers to the repetition of an action in the sense of "again and again, yet further."[70]

d. Biblical Aramaic uses *twb* just as does Egyptian Aramaic. The peal of *twb* occurs only twice (Dnl. 4:31,33[34,36]). The restitution of King Nebuchadnezzar is portrayed in the solemn style of proclamation, twice (!) recounting how at the end of the period of chastisement his reason *(manda')* returned to him,[71] bringing to an end this animal-like stage of life. This "return" of his reason brought about two results: his capacity to praise God (v. 31[34]) and his restoration as ruler, whereupon "majesty and splendor were restored" to him as well (v. 33[36]).

In the haphel, *twb* refers to the sending of a report (Ezra 5:5), specifically an answer to an official query (*hatîḇ piṯgām,* v. 11; Dnl. 3:16), then for the return of the holy vessels to the temple (Ezra 6:5). The expression *haṯîḇ 'ēṭā' ûṭe'ēm* in Dnl. 2:14 is problematic; perhaps the meaning is "turn to someone with counsel and reason" (cf. Prov. 26:16; 1QS 6:9; differently: "find the right word at the decisive moment"[72]). One notices now that in the Aramaic OT texts *twb* is never used theologically, so that a semantic change is already discernible that shifts the notion of "return" in the ethical-religious sense more and more from the verb to the noun *teṯûḇā',* something unmistakably clear in Galilean Aramaic.[73]

In the Aramaic of the Tgs., *twb* appears precisely where the MT has *šwb;* a different situation obtains in the textual paraphrases and Midrashim. A clear and dominant semantic shift is discernible in the direction "(do) penance."[74]

e. The language of the Samaritans uses this root in a central position in basing its messianic expectations on Dt. 18:15ff., expecting the "returning" Moses as their messiah. The messiah accordingly is called *Ta'ēb,* "the one who returns" to set up the holy tabernacle on Gerizim.[75]

f. The root *twb* occurs only rarely in the Nabatean inscriptions dating between 200 B.C.E. and 200 C.E. A tomb inscription at Qasr el-Bint in Petra contains a formulaic imprecation threatening those who might desecrate the tomb, wishing that "his inheritance

---

parison with Jer. 21:3 [*sāḇaḇ*], see T. Veijola, "Davidsverheissung und Staatsvertrag," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 9-31, esp. 15-16.

68. *AP* 1.7.

69. See R. Yaron, "Aramaic Deeds of Conveyance," *Bibl* 41 (1960) 269-71.

70. *AP* 9.12; Ahiqar 44 (XII 13]), extremely uncertain reading; so also *RES,* 1298 A 5.

71. On this expression see Arab. *ṯāba 'ilaihi 'aqluhu,* Lane, I/1, 361.

72. So A. Bentzen, *Daniel. HAT* I/19 (²1952), 22.

73. See Dietrich, 316-47.

74. Cf. *ChW,* 531-32; *WTM,* IV, 516, 675; M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat Gan, 1990), 576-77; Beyer, 721-22.

75. See A. Merx, *Der Messias oder Ta'eb der Samaritaner. BZAW* 17 (1909).

pass to the rightful (heir)" (*ytwb ḥlqh l 'ṣdqh*, l. 4), thereby asserting that such a person has forfeited the right to live. Two other graffiti witnesses may use *twb* adverbially.[76]

g. The Palmyrene inscriptions (1st-4th centuries C.E.) attest *twb* only adverbially meaning "further, again" in describing the continuation of an action, albeit now with different objects.[77]

8. *Syriac, Mandaic.* a. In Syriac, *tāḇ* means "return, turn around, do penance," in the aphel "give back, answer, deliver a message." The noun *tîḇûṯā'* now has the specialized meaning *poenitentia,* and the adj. *tayyāḇā'* shifts from *poenitens* to *rebellis.* Two adverbs are formed from the verb meaning "again" and "backward."[78] Syriac rarely uses *tb* to render Heb. *šwb,* instead generally using *hpk* and *pn',* with the latter completely replacing biblical *šwb* in connection with religious-ethical repentance.

b. This root is richly attested in Mandaic. The writings of this gnostic baptism sect[79] contain over 30 occurrences of the root and its substantival formatives *taiaba, taiabuta, tiabuta,* and *'tiabuta*[80] meaning "return, turn around, regret, repent; go into oneself," etc., including "repent" in the religious-ethical sense. The meaning is qualified as "no longer sin, be baptized in flowing water," and "join the community of faith." The nouns, taking an implied divine subject, are used in connection with "forbearance, compassion, forgiveness, reconciliation." Mandaic basically covers the secular semantic spectrum of the root with *hdr,*[81] and the negative sense "fall away, cause to fall away" with *hpk.*

9. *Egyptian.* The Egyptian root *wšb*[82] is attested since the Middle Kingdom in the meanings "answer, step in for someone, protect someone, call to account," as well as in the substantival formatives *wšbw,* "the one who answers, advocate," *wšb.t,* "professional mourner," and finally *wšb.ty,* "Ushebti," "the one who answers" as a designation for the small, usually mummy-shaped burial gifts serving the dead and who answer for the deceased in judgment.[83]

The diverse dialects of Coptic accordingly also attest the root in the meanings "answer, repay."[84]

10. *Phoenician-Punic.* The root *šwb* is virtually unattested in Phoenician-Punic, perhaps once in the PN *yšb'l,* "may Ba'al lead back,"[85] and perhaps once in a dedica-

---

76. *RES,* 528, 529; cf. *ESE,* II, 264.

77. See H. Ingholt, "Five Dated Tombs from Palmyra," *Berytus* 2 (1935) 86, l. 8; 3 (1936) 99, l. 4.

78. *LexSyr,* 817.

79. See K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer I-II. FRLANT* 74-75 (1960-61).

80. See *MdD,* 478, 483-84.

81. *MdD,* 131.

82. *WbÄS,* I, 371-73.

83. *RÄR,* 849-53; on this derivation of *šwb* cf. E. Mahler, *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, London* 34 (1912) 146-51, 197; and P. Pierret, ibid., 247.

84. See J. Černy, *Coptic Etymological Dictionary* (Cambridge, 1976), 181, 221.

85. *CIS* 159.3; cf. Benz, 327.

1. *Occurrences.* In the qal, *šwb* occurs 206 times in the prophets, nearly twice as frequently as in the Pentateuch (113 times). Measured according to the length of the books, the leaders are then Jeremiah with 78 times, Hosea with 19, Zechariah with 14, and Daniel with 12 + 3; then Ezekiel with 37, Isaiah with 32, Amos with 6, and Malachi with 5. Neither Habakkuk nor Haggai uses *šwb* qal. Although the distribution in the Pentateuch (41 times in Genesis, 18 in Exodus, 12 in Leviticus, 21 each in Numbers and Deuteronomy) does not reveal much, the (albeit hypothetical) distribution according to sources yields 37 in J, 21 in E, and 14 in P.

Clear trends emerge in the Dtr History with 192 occurrences over against the Chronicler's History with only 59.

Wisdom writings use the root infrequently, with 19 occurrences in Job, 8 in Proverbs, 10 in Ecclesiastes, and 14 in Sirach.[97] The 41 occurrences in the Psalms do not reveal any obvious concentration.

The hiphil of *šwb* occurs 88 times in the prophets and just as frequently in the Dtr History (42 in the Chronicler's History), then 63 times each in the Pentateuch and the wisdom writings. The leaders among the prophets are Jeremiah with 30 occurrences, Amos with 9, Ezekiel with 21, and Isaiah with 16. In the Pentateuch E seems to predominate with 27 occurrences over against J with 4 and P with 9. It occurs 18 times in Sirach.

In the hophal, *šwb* occurs 4 times in the Pentateuch and once in Jeremiah. In the pilel/polal it occurs 4 times in Ezekiel, 3 each in Isaiah and Jeremiah, and twice in the Psalms and Sirach.

The noun *mᵉšûḇâ* occurs 9 times in Jeremiah, twice in Hosea, and once in Proverbs. The noun *tᵉšûḇâ* occurs 4 times in the Dtr History, twice in the Chronicler's History and in Job. The nouns *šôḇāḇ* and *šôḇēḇ* occur most often in Jeremiah and Isaiah.[98]

2. *Expressions.* Commensurate with the high frequency of occurrences, *šwb* qal enters into a great many different syntactical combinations that more or less reveal clear semantic qualifications.

a. This is especially clear with regard to the frequent expressions with *'el, lᵉ,* and *min.* The expression *šwb 'el* means "return to someone" (Gen. 8:9) or "return to a place" (Gen. 28:21), also "turn again to someone" (Zech. 1:3); *šwb lᵉ* means "return to someone" (Lev. 27:24) or "return to a place" (Gen. 18:33), "turn to (something)" (Prov. 1:23), "turn into something" (Isa. 29:17) or + inf. "return to do something" (1 K. 12:24), "do something yet again" (Hos. 11:9); in the expression *šwb lᵉḏarkô,* "return on one's way" (Gen. 33:16), the qal almost takes on the meaning of a hiphil. The expression *šwb min* means "return from a place" (Jgs. 3:19), "turn away from something" (Jer. 4:28; take back a vow, Jgs. 11:35), and "return after doing something" (*min* + inf.; Gen. 14:17).

---

97. See in this regard D. Barthélemy and O. Rickenbacher, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Sirach* (Göttingen, 1973), 395-96.

98. See the statistics and discussion of disputed occurrences in Soggin, 1312-13; Holladay, 6-9, 169-91; *HAL,* IV, 1427ff.

Less frequent expressions include those with *mēʾaḥ^a^rê,* "return from a thing/person" (1 S. 24:2[Eng. 1]; Jer. 32:40), *ʾaḥ^a^rê,* "follow someone" (Ruth 1:15; NRSV "go back to"), *ʾāḥôr,* "withdraw from someone" (Lam. 1:8), "give way to someone" (Ps. 9:4[3]; NRSV "turn back"), *ʾ^a^ḥōrannîṯ,* "turn backward" (2 K. 20:10), *ʿal,* "return to something/someone" (Prov. 26:11), "turn to someone" (2 Ch. 30:9), *mēʿal,* "return from a place/person" (Gen. 8:3; 2 K. 18:14), *ʿaḏ,* "turn to someone, return to someone [God]" (Hos. 14:2[1]; Am. 4:6,8,11), "become again" (Mic. 1:7). Expressions with *b^e^* mean "something returns/falls back on" (e.g., bloodguilt; 1 K. 2:33); with *k^e^,* "become again, be restored" (Ex. 4:7), and *mipp^e^nê,* "turn away, retreat from something/someone (in fear)" (Job 39:22; Prov. 30:30).

Since *šwb* hiphil can take a direct object, it enters less frequently into prepositional expressions. It is used with *ʾāḥôr,* "cause to retreat, withdraw" (Isa. 44:25), "withdraw (one's hand) from something" (Lam. 2:3; without *ʾāḥôr* in Josh. 8:26), *min,* "turn away from" (Ezk. 14:6), *mēʿal,* "turn away [e.g., anger] from someone" (Nu. 25:11), *l^e^,* "repay (revenge) someone for something" (Gen. 50:15), so also with *ʿal* (2 S. 16:8); *hēšîḇ ʾel* can mean "inform someone" (Est. 4:13; NRSV "reply").

The pilel and polal of *šwb* are similarly transitive/causative and are used with *min* to mean "bring back from" (Ezk. 39:27) and *ʾel* to mean "bring back to" (Isa. 49:5).

b. Beyond such expressions *šwb* qal also enters into many fixed expressions with other verbs or nouns, including *hālôḵ wāšôḇ* (Gen. 8:3), *hōlēḵ wāšāḇ* (1 S. 17:15), *yāṣôʾ wāšôḇ* (Gen. 8:7), *rāṣôʾ wāšôḇ* (Ezk. 1:14), and *ʿōḇēr wāšāḇ* (Ezk. 35:7), all basically meaning "back and forth."

The subject of *šwb* is frequently *ʾap,* "anger," with the meaning "someone's anger lets up" (Gen. 27:45), or *lēḇ,* "heart": "someone's heart turns to someone" (1 K. 12:27).[99]

c. *hēšîḇ* is often used with certain accusative objects, including *ʾap,* "turn one's anger toward someone" (Isa. 66:15), though also "restrain" (Ps. 78:38), the same meaning with *ḥēmâ* (Prov. 15:1), *rûaḥ* (Job 15:13), and *ḥārôn* (Ezra 10:14); then *hēšîḇ dāḇār,* "answer, report" (1 K. 12:6);[100] *hēšîḇ ʾ^a^mārîm,* "give information" (1 K. 12:6); *hēšîḇ yāḏô,* "draw back one's hand" (Josh. 8:26), though also "turn one's hand against someone" (Am. 1:8); *hēšîḇ pānîm,* "turn toward someone" (Dnl. 11:18-19); *hēšîḇ lēḇ,* "turn one's heart [attention] to someone" (Mal. 3:24[4:6]); but cf. *hēšîḇ ʿal/ʾel-lēḇ,* "take something to heart," Dt. 4:39; Isa. 46:8); *hēšîḇ nepeš,* "revive the soul" (Ps. 19:8[7]; cf. also *šôḇēḇ nepeš,* Ps. 23:3[101]); the expressions *hēšîḇ g^e^mûl* (Ps. 94:2) and *hēšîḇ nāqām* (Dt. 32:41,43) mean "pay back, repay (revenge)."

3. *Word Field.* The broad distribution of the root is accompanied by an extremely comprehensive word field. Because *šwb* is a verb of motion, in many cases its meaning

99. Concerning the expressions *šwb š^e^ḇûṯ (š^e^ḇîṯ, šîḇaṯ),* all of which seem to presuppose a transitive qal (par. *hēšîḇ š^e^ḇûṯ*), cf. the discussion → שְׁבוּת *š^e^ḇûṯ,* with extensive bibliog.; also Willi-Plein.

100. See Arad Ostracon 111:4.

101. See in this regard S. Mittmann, "Aufbau und Einheit des Danklieds Psalm 23," *ZTK* 77 (1980) 1-23.

(Isa. 30:15) in deriving this name from *yāšaḇ*, hence "(a place of) rest is God," though S. C. Layton[104] points out that the name is already well attested in Amor. *šub-na-ilum* and similar names and is semantically reliable.[105] Because here as in Hebrew the imperative is supported by paragogical *(n)a,* there is no reason to doubt the meaning.

The PN *šbn-yhw,* "turn back, Yahweh!" is attested only in Hebrew epigraphy and might represent a parallel construction using "Yahweh."[106]

Yet another name may represent a hypocorism constructed from *šwb* qal, namely, *šōḇay,* "turn back!" in Ezra 2:42 and Neh. 7:45, the name of a family of doorkeepers in the postexilic temple. Its earliest previous witness is a letter from Meṣad Ḥashavyahu (late 7th century) and several seals.[107] It is also attested in Imperial Aramaic, Palmyrene, Nabatean, and Old North Arabic. Its possible derivation from several different roots makes its meaning uncertain.[108] F. Gröndahl's much-discussed proposal[109] that one interpret the name based on its formal proximity to the Akkadian name *ša-pi-ili,* "the one promised by God,"[110] was rejected by A. F. Rainey in favor of a derivation from *šwb.*[111]

Epigraphic evidence also attests names without *(n)a,* e.g., *šb'l,*[112] which rather suggests a name given as a thanksgiving in the sense "God has (beneficently) returned" or something similar.[113] This name is widely attested: Ugar. *ṯbil* and *šu-ub-am-mu;*[114] Ammonite;[115] and Old Aram. *šb'l.*[116]

The name *šb'* is attested primarily in Aramaic epigraphy[117] and in Palmyra,[118]

---

104. Layton, *Archaic Features of Canaanite Personal Names in the Hebrew Bible. HSM* 47 (1990), 51.

105. Documentation of the Amorite in I. J. Gelb, *Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite. AS* 21 (1980), 642; cf. also *APNM,* 86-87, 266.

106. Arad ostraca 60:3 (late 8th century); 27:4 (early 6th century); cf. Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions* (Eng. trans., Jerusalem, 1975), 55, 91; additional forms in G. I. Davies, *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions* (Cambridge, 1991), 489-90.

107. See Davies, 489.

108. See *HAL,* IV, 1391b; Benz, 412.

109. *PNU,* 47, 97, et passim.

110. Cf. *APN,* 215.

111. "Observations on Ugaritic Grammar," *UF* 3 (1971) 164.

112. Gibeon inscription 21, *TSSI,* I, 56; cf. Davies, *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions,* 95; cf. T. Ornan, "Le répertoire iconographique des sceaux araméens inscrits et son évolution," *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals. OBO* 125 (1993), 56ff. Nimrud Ostracon 1:4; see J. B. Segal, "An Aramaic Ostracon from Nimrud," *Iraq* 19 (1957) 140; cf. W. F. Albright, "An Ostracon from Calah and the North-Israelite Diaspora," *BASOR* 149 (1958) 33.

113. See J. D. Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew: A Comparative Study. JSOTSup* 49 (1988), 95-96.

114. *PNU,* 200; on the EA witnesses see A. F. Rainey, *UF* 3 (1971) 164.

115. See W. E. Aufrecht, *A Corpus of Ammonite Inscriptions. Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies* 4 (1989) 374.

116. See M. Maraqten, *Die semitischen Personennamen in den alt- und reichsaramäischen Inschriften aus Vorderasien* (Hildesheim, 1988), 215-16.

117. *DNSI,* II, 1114-15; Maraqten, 215.

118. *PNPI,* 113.

underworld (Ps. 9:8[7]), and the womb (Job 1:21). No one returns to life from death (2 S. 12:23; Job 10:21; Prov. 2:19), nor from darkness (Job 15:22). The term can also refer to the healing of a body (return to health; 2 K. 5:10) or of a body part (1 K. 13:6). In isolated instances *šwb* refers to changing one's mind (Job 6:29), turning from one's wrath (Ex. 32:12), acting against one's promises (Jgs. 11:35), regretting what one has said (Jer. 4:28), and turning away from someone in disappointment (Lam. 1:8).

2. *Pilel/Polal.* The pilel differs from the causative hiphil in that in a more factitive fashion it, like other intransitive verbs, expresses a direct bringing about in which the object is transferred passively into a new condition:[137] "bring back to a specific place" or "transfer back into a certain condition" (e.g., Jer. 50:19), "restore something" (e.g., Isa. 58:12), "restore a life that is as good as lost" (Ps. 23:3).[138] The polal means to "be restored" passively (e.g., Ezk. 38:8) or actively to "lead someone astray" (e.g., Isa. 47:10).

3. *Hiphil/Hophal.* Physical movement also plays an important role in the hiphil in the sense "lead someone back, prompt someone to return" (e.g., 1 S. 29:4), "bring someone back to his position, reinstall a person" (e.g., Gen. 41:13; 2 S. 19:11[10]; Ps. 80:4[3]), "bring someone/something home" (e.g., 1 S. 6:7), "transport something back" (e.g., 2 S. 15:25), "put something back in its place" (e.g., Gen. 29:3), "give/pay something back" (Ex. 22:25[26]; Jgs. 17:3-4). These meanings quickly shift to the comprehensive notion of "paying back, revenging," either in interpersonal relationships or in theological contexts. The expression *hēšîḇ pānîm* can mean "turn someone away, refuse someone" (1 K. 2:16), though also "pay attention to someone" (e.g., Dnl. 11:19; with *lēḇ* in Mal. 3:24[4:6]). The expression *hēšîḇ yāḏ,* "withdraw (one's) hand," plays an important role in exercising power (e.g., 2 S. 8:3). The hiphil quite often (about 45 times) means "answer" (generally with the obj. *dāḇār,* e.g., Gen. 37:14), though also "revoke" (an order, *kāṯûḇ* or *sēp̄er,* of the king, e.g., Est. 8:5,8).

The hophal constitutes the passive of the hiphil to mean "be brought back" (e.g., Ex. 10:8), "be put back" (Gen. 42:28), and "be repaid" (Nu. 5:8).

4. *Nouns.* Only *tᵉšûḇâ* is used largely in secular contexts. It can refer to the physical return of the prophet Samuel to Ramah (1 S. 7:17); or, in the construct expression *liṯšûḇaṯ haššānâ,* "at the turn of the year," it can refer to time in a more neutral fashion (2 S. 11:1; 1 K. 20:22,26; 1 Ch. 20:1; 2 Ch. 36:10). The book of Job uses the noun to refer to the friends' "answer" to Job (Job 21:34) or to his answer to them (34:36); in both passages this "answer" exhibits features of disqualification.

---

137. See *HP,* 34.
138. See S. Mittmann, *ZTK* 77 (1980) 1-23, esp. 5-7.

V. Theological Semantic Categories.

1. *Qal.* The various aspects of religious repentance and its opposite dominate the semantic categories of the qal in theological contexts. A person can return to God (e.g., Jer. 4:1), turn away from evil (e.g., Jer. 15:7), fall away from God (e.g., Nu. 14:43), abandon the covenant (e.g., Jer. 8:4,6); God can turn to Israel (e.g., Josh. 24:20), return to Israel (e.g., Isa. 1:3), or withdraw from Israel (e.g., Jer. 32:40).

2. *Pilel/Polel.* The pilel/polel can mean "become apostate" (e.g., Jer. 8:5).

3. *Hiphil/Hophal.* The notion of physical movement frequently attested in the hiphil can have significant theological implications especially when referring to the return from exile (e.g., Jer. 12:15), when Yahweh makes the waters of the sea flow back (Ex. 15:19) or brings plagues upon Egypt (Dt. 28:60). He turns back the wise and "makes their knowledge foolish" (Isa. 44:25). With God as the subject, *hēšîḇ* frequently means "repay" (e.g., 2 S. 22:21). In contexts involving life and death, God can turn someone back to dust (Job 10:9), but can also bring him back from death (2 S. 12:23), revivify him (obj. *nepeš,* e.g., Ps. 35:17). When God withdraws his hand, it means trouble for Israel (Ezk. 20:22).

The prophet's task can be to turn God's wrath *('ap)* away from the people (e.g., Jer. 18:20) or to bring Israel back to God and to repentance (e.g., Neh. 9:26,29). In its own turn, the people should repent (Ezk. 14:6; 18:30,32), in which case God will take them back (Lam. 5:21).

4. *Nouns.* Substantival derivations of *šwb* are also clearly involved in theological contexts.

a. The term *šûḇâ* (Isa. 30:15) is used in a theological context referring to the repentance that the prophet himself advocates.[139] Here *šûḇâ* parallels *naḥaṯ,* "rest," *šᵉqēṭ,* "quietness," and *biṭḥâ,* "trust." Because the meaning "repentance" disrupts this series,[140] scholars since Gesenius[141] have repeatedly proposed a derivation from *yāšaḇ* in the sense of "sit still."[142] Although J. Høgenhaven believes that such religious repentance or turning is otherwise unattested in Isaiah, Gonçalves argues mainly from the parallel with *naḥaṯ.*[143] Still others derive the term from *šwb* in proposing a middle path in the sense of "turning away from all activities lacking in faith."[144] One should proba-

---

139. See VII.3 below.

140. See Gonçalves, 171-74.

141. *GesTh,* 1375.

142. Sauer, 286-88; Kreuzer; O. Kaiser, "Literarkritik und Tendenzkritik: Überlegungen zur Methode der Jesajaexegese," in J. Vermeylen, ed., *Le livre d'Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures unité et complexité de l'ouvrage. BETL* 81 (1989), 70.

143. J. Høgenhaven, "Gott und Volk bei Jesaja. Eine Untersuchung zur biblischen Theologie," *Acta theologica danica* 24 (1988) 206.

144. C. A. Keller, "Das quietistische Element in der Botschaft des Jesaja," *TZ* 11 (1955) 86.

Another interesting constellation emerges in the story of the spies sent into Canaan in Nu. 13–14. The key event is clearly the return of the spies: "At the end of forty days they returned *(yāšûḇû)* from spying out the land" (13:25). With this P material the redactor possibly displaced the J version, since after the spies traverse the country (vv. 22,24) J continues immediately with the men's report (vv. 27ff.). Even though P rarely uses *šwb,* it does also refer to the spies' report as *hēšîḇ dāḇār* (v. 26b; so also in the par. Dt. 1:22,25 and the back reference Josh. 14:7), whereas J uses *sipper* (v. 27a). Nonetheless, there is no synonymity, since according to J the men deliver a report to Moses, whereas according to P they report before *kol-hā'ēḏâ.* For practical theological reasons relating to the postexilic period, R^P gives the story considerable ethical drama by having the men "bring back an unfavorable report" about the land (*yāṣā' dibbâ,* 13:32), leading the people to complain (14:36). It is uncertain whether J already associated his story with this sort of ethical aspect by having Moses say "because you have turned back from following Yahweh" (*šwb mē'aḥ*ᵃ*rê yhwh,* par. "transgress Yahweh's command," v. 41), "Yahweh will not be with you" (v. 43). The connection with the account of the spies was probably a secondary creation, since the present verses are concerned more with articulating the reasons for the following defeat at Hormah (v. 45).

It is remarkable that *šwb* is virtually never used in the Tetrateuch in the sense of "turning away from" and "returning to" God. Because the Yahwist statement in Nu. 14:43 is unique, it is also suspect from a literary-critical perspective, as underscored by the fact that otherwise only R^P uses *šwb* in this way, specifically in an unequivocal retrospective on the account of the spies *and* the events at Hormah (cf. Yahweh's doubly kindled wrath in 32:10,13); R^P concludes the retrospective with the parenesis, "If you turn away from following him, he will again abandon them [the whole people] in the wilderness" (32:15). The context is clear in both instances: turning away from Yahweh is identical with not keeping a divine precept — a theme more likely deriving from the postexilic era.

2. *Joseph Story.* In the story of Joseph the narrative progression itself offers reason enough for a particular concentration of *šwb* occurrences (24 times). The movement back and forth between Canaan and Egypt, between Joseph and Jacob/Israel, the numerous dialogues, and not least the secret "putting back" of payment for grain explain the density of occurrences here, albeit exclusively in secular semantic contexts. Yet even here in the Joseph story *šwb* also occasionally addresses central theological themes whose significance emerges only after one has answered the redactional question whether the Joseph story represents a continuation of the pentateuchal sources (in which case it would basically represent a 7th-century product of JE[149]), whether one must assume the presence of an independent literary development (possibly on the basis of an earlier tradition), i.e., one running independently of the usual pentateuchal

149. So H. Gunkel, *Genesis* (Eng. trans., Macon, Ga., 1997), 380ff.; L. Ruppert, *Die Josepherzählung in der Genesis. SANT* 11 (1965); J. Scharbert, *Genesis. NEB* (1986); L. Schmidt, *Literarische Studien zur Josephsgeschichte. BZAW* 167 (1986).

for protection when such a person flees to them (35:25); there he will then live till the death of the current high priest; thereafter he may return to his own home (vv. 28,32).

c. The Holiness Code similarly uses the root (14 times) in completely heterogeneous contexts. The widowed daughter of a priest is permitted to return to her father's house and is thus again permitted to partake of the sacred offerings. Finally, the regulations governing the Year of Jubilee are tailor-made for using *šwb* given this year's involvement with the "return" of persons to their own property (Lev. 25:10,13; cf. 27:24) and the "return" of property to them (vv. 27-28). The same applies to the impoverished full citizens who have entered debt slavery and who can now freely "go out" *(yāṣā')* and "return" to their own families (25:41). Land sold during the period between Years of Jubilee can be bought back by "paying back" an interpolated sum (vv. 27-28). Slaves can similarly be bought back (vv. 51-52).

Fabry

VII. Preexilic Prophets. The root *šwb* in the sense of "return, repent" often functions as a key word in prophetic proclamation and even as a description of the prophets' goal, an understanding supported by the OT itself. 2 K. 17:13 refers to "every prophet and every seer" (cj. *BHS*) making the common summons: "Turn from your evil ways and keep my commandments and my statutes." Is this understanding of the prophets as proclaimers of the law, an understanding developed retrospectively and one that has enduringly influenced Jewish as well as Christian exegetical tradition, an appropriate one?

Evidence for such an understanding is lacking in tradition for the prophets of the 10th and 9th centuries. Although Elijah can indeed ask the people, "How long will you go limping with two different opinions?" thus demanding a decision between Yahweh and Ba'al (1 K. 18:21), when prophets before Amos spoke in the divine 1st person they addressed individuals, generally the king, and not yet the people as a whole. Moreover, their divine words contain not warnings or admonitions but rather absolute formulations predicting the future, occasionally salvation, but more frequently disaster.

Hence a different understanding of prophecy, one also found in 2 K. 17 and conceiving the prophets from the perspective of future predictions, is more appropriate. The fall of the northern kingdom (v. 23), later also of the southern kingdom (24:2), represents the realization of prophetic announcements of disaster; from the Dtr perspective the history of the people of God can similarly appear in the larger sense as the realization of the prophetically proclaimed word of God.[155]

An even more difficult task is to reconcile the image of the summons to repentance and renewed obedience with the prophets of the 8th and 7th centuries. Amos is con-

155. Cf. G. von Rad, "The Deuteronomic Theology of History in I and II Kings," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. trans., New York, 1966), 205-21; W. Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte. FRLANT* 108 (1972); a critical view in E. Würthwein, "Prophetisches Wort und Geschichte in den Königsbüchern," *AT und Christliche Verkündigung. FS A. H. J. Gunneweg* (Stuttgart, 1987), 399-411.

them" (v. 12[13]). By contrast, the conditional threats in Lev. 26 directed against all of Israel are "essentially post-prophetic."[159]

The intention of the prophet's assertion corresponds to his overall message, namely, that repentance ("returning"), rather than representing a current option, in fact represents a past possibility that was forfeited, i.e., not seized. The retrospective aims not at changing Israel's behavior but at confronting Israel with its own guilt in thus justifying the proclamation of disaster (Am. 4:12).

In this context v. 12 is indeed difficult to understand. To what do the announcements "thus I will do to you" and "because I will do this to you" actually refer? H. W. Wolff, who believes the section was redacted during the period of Josiah, finds in the particle *kōh* and in the demonstrative pronoun *zōʾṯ* a possible allusion to the destruction of Bethel;[160] in that case, however, one would have to translate the imperfects in v. 12a — contrary to their usual use in prophetic proclamation — as preterites, or would have to assume that what is said ("I will do") does not correspond to what is meant ("I have done"). Is the text perhaps focusing on Israel's guilt? "Thus," i.e., as a people that did not return, will Yahweh now deal with Israel, and "this," i.e., the failure to repent and return, he will now repay upon Israel. In any event, it is clear that the summons "prepare to meet your God, O Israel!" is given an ominous turn by the appropriately prepositioned *lāḵēn.* As in 5:18-20, "why do you want the day of Yahweh?" so also here reference to the listeners' own guilt transforms their expectation of salvation into its opposite.

The text does not explain just how the demanded but refused return might have been carried out. Nor does the formulation itself offer any hints. The expression *šwb ʿaḏ-yhwh* recurring in Dt. 4:30; 30:2; Isa. 9:12(13); 19:22; Hos. 14:2(1) initially suggests a turning away from other gods and a turning back to Yahweh under the rubric of Yahweh's claim to exclusivity.[161] Dt. 4:30; 30:2; and Isa. 9:12(13), however, which explicate such "returning" as "seeking God" and "hearing his voice," do at least also imply that this return includes obedience to God's ethical guidance.[162] Moreover, one cannot really hear in the use of *ʿaḏ* instead of the usual *ʾel* any emphasis on the first commandment ("not only *in the direction* toward him . . . but emphatically right *up to* him himself"[163]), as shown by the juxtaposition of the two formulations in Hos. 14:2-3(1-2) and Dt. 30:2,10.

H. M. Barstad advocates yet another understanding of the expression *šûḇ ʿaḏ-yhwh,* finding in 4:6-11 "'a missionary' . . . usage of the word *šwb*" and translating "turn to" instead of "return to."[164] Amos finds it futile to try "to convince his fellow countrymen that they should leave off worshipping the deities at Bethel and Gilgal and turn to

159. J. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels. WMANT* 35 (1970), 171.

160. *Joel and Amos,* 217-18.

161. Ibid., 220.

162. See Markert, *Struktur,* 123 nn. 255-56.

163. Wolff, *GSAT,* 145.

164. *The Religious Polemics of Amos. SVT* 34 (1984), 58ff., here 66.

added later[172]): "for my anger has turned from them" (*šwb min;* cf. Isa. 9:11,16,20[10, 17,21]; 5:25). Because Yahweh will enable Israel to do what it could not do on its own, the prophet can now issue the call to return in his oracle of salvation (14:2a,3a[1a,2a]). These imperatives are not a condition of salvation, but rather an invitation to seize and make good the opportunity that has been issued anew after the actualization of judgment (v. 2b[1b]; cf. 5:5). At the same time, against the background of the failure to repent and return in 6:1-3, the admonitions now clarify just what Hosea understands to be the substance of genuine return, namely, a confession of guilt (14:3[2]) and a renunciation of all false trust in foreign as well as one's own military strength (v. 4aα[3aα]; cf. 5:13; 7:11; 8:9; 12:2[1]; 10:13b), which effectively denies God's status as Israel's God (13:4; cf. 12:10[9]), and finally a renunciation of idols, which breaks the second commandment (v. 4aβ[3aβ]; cf. 8:4-6; 10:5-6; 13:1-2). Here a plea (14:3b[2b]) replaces the *securitas* that expected the turn to salvation to come about virtually as a natural necessity (6:1b-3).

d. In Hos. 7:10 and 11:5b,[173] the book of Hosea picks up the prophet's understanding of Israel's unwillingness to return. In 3:5 Hosea's pupils[174] also dissociate the expectation that God's chastising actions will bring Israel to its senses (2:9[7]) from the demonstration of guilt and turn it into an independent hope within the oracle of salvation: "Afterward the Israelites shall return and seek Yahweh their God . . . they shall come in awe to Yahweh and to his goodness *(pāḥaḏ).*" This verse reaches far beyond the symbolic actions in vv. 1ff. by interpreting judgment (v. 4) as a temporally limited pedagogical device and by abandoning the typically Hoseanic interweaving or simultaneity of judgment and salvation (2:16-17[14-15]) in favor of a temporal sequence; it remains true to the prophet's message in that it does view punishment as being inevitable and also picks up motives from 5:15 and 11:11 with the expression *biqqēš 'eṯ-yhwh* and the vb. *pāḥaḏ.*

3. *Isaiah.* a. Isaiah addresses the theme "return" only in the demonstration of guilt. Like Amos (Am. 4:6-11), Isaiah finds in an historical retrospective of the northern kingdom that "the people did not turn to him who struck them" (Isa. 9:12[13]). Through *parallelismus membrorum* the prophet then elucidates such "turning" as "seeking Yahweh," which following the juxtaposition in 31:1 refers to the kind of trust that renounces one's own power and self-assertion and instead seeks help and salvation in God alone. "In returning *(šûḇâ)* and rest you shall be saved; in quietness and in trust shall be your strength. But you refused" (30:15; cf. 28:12; 30:9,12, etc.). Some interpreters have tried to derive the noun *šûḇâ* not from *šwb* but from an identical secondary form of *yšb,* translating then as "sitting still."[175] The usual understanding, however, requires far fewer assumptions and is also suggested by 9:12(13).[176]

---

172. Wolff, *Hosea,* 232 n. i.
173. Jeremias, "Eschatologie," 229; idem, *Hosea,* 98, 143.
174. Jeremias, "Eschatologie," 224-26.
175. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. trans. 2002), 156-57 (with bibliog.).
176. See IV.4 above.

Isa. 30:15 presents as an answerable human deed (30:16-17) that which in the call to "make the mind of this people dull" (6:9-10; cf. 29:9-12) was presented as God's own work. Hence as in Hosea (Hos. 11:7),[177] the unwillingness to return and the incapacity to do so are interwoven, though Isaiah does go beyond his predecessor in explicitly attributing the element of unwillingness back to God. Does this not represent the ultimate expression of the unconditional and intransigent quality of divine judgment? It is uncertain, however, whether the call narrative does exclude not only in substance but explicitly as well the possibility that the prophet's message might prompt the people to return. The pointing of *wšb* in Isa. 6:10 does allow one to view it as the predicate, yielding the translation "so that it [the people] does not return"; doing so, however, requires an unspoken change of subject within the sentence. Hence a modal understanding ("again"; cf. 6:13) is preferable.

b. Like Amos before him (Am. 1:8), Isaiah uses the expression *hēšîḇ yāḏ 'al* to proclaim divine judgment (Isa. 1:25). He also uses the root *šwb* to evoke for his listeners the inevitability of judgment, of God's "outstretched hand" (14:27) as well as the comprehensive nature of the disaster. Hence he invokes the name of his first son, Shear-yashub, in announcing that only "a remnant shall return," i.e., from battle (7:3).

This symbolic name is probably not to be understood as a promise that "a remnant will return/repent," but rather, like that of the brother, "the spoil speeds, the prey hastens" (8:3-4), as an "anticipatory judgment."[178] Unconditional oracles of disaster directed at the entire people such as those in 5:6-7,24,29; 6:11; 28:2-4,18-20 leave little hope even for such a remnant. As for Amos (Am. 3:12; cf. 5:3), so too for Isaiah this name it merely a symbol for the devastating dimensions of the catastrophe (Isa. 30:17; cf. 1:8; 17:3,5-6; 30:14). It was the redactors who first discovered in this remnant the goal of judgment, the bearer of new salvation (1:9; 4:2-6; 6:13; 7:22; 11:11-26; 28:5; 37:30-32).[179] The original meaning, however, can still explicitly be maintained (10:20-23).

With the refrain "for all this his anger has not turned away; his hand is stretched out still" (9:11,16,20[12,17,21]; 5:25; as an addendum in 10:4), which understands God's previous blows against the northern kingdom as merely preliminary, Isaiah now prepares the concluding announcement of the "nation far away" from which "no one can rescue" (5:29).[180] God's wrath reaches its goal only with the utter annihilation of the southern kingdom as well.

The formulation *šûḇ (ḥ^arôn) 'ap-yhwh (min)* occurs frequently (Nu. 25:4; 2 Ch. 12:12; 29:10; 30:8; Job 14:13; Jer. 2:35; 4:8; 23:20; 30:24; Dnl. 9:16; Hos. 14:5[4]). Did this expression originate in Isaiah's proclamation? Because Nu. 25:4b uses the divine name within Yahweh's own discourse, it (together with v. 5) may represent a later

---

177. See VII.2 above.

178. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–39,* 110; cf. 27-31.

179. See J. Hausmann, *Israels Rest. Studien zum Selbstverständnis der nachexilischen Gemeinde. BWANT* 124 (1987), 139-70.

180. On the repositioning of 5:25-29[,30] behind 9:20[21], cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 223-26.

addition.[181] Hos. 14:5b(4b), "for my anger has turned from them," is discernible as a secondary addendum because of the change in number.[182] The hemistich already picks up the substance of Isa. 9:11,16,20(12,17,21), and 5:25 and reverses it within the salvation oracle. All the other passages similarly presuppose Isaiah's proclamation.

c. In Isaiah's proclamation of salvation, *hēšîḇ* expresses the *restitutio in integrum* of Jerusalem (1:26). In judgment Yahweh will restore what the city lost, "your judges as at the first," and "your counselors as at the beginning."

d. Later editors pick up the key word *šwb* in continuing Isaiah's salvific expectation, in part following the proclamation of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah. They anticipate the redemption of "those in her [Zion] who repent *(šāḇeyhā),* by righteousness" (1:27), the turning away of God's wrath (12:1 cj.; cf. *BHS*[183]), a transformation of nature (29:17), the return of the redeemed to Zion (35:10), indeed, even the conversion of Egypt to Yahweh by means of "striking and healing" (19:22).

The meaning of the suffixed pl. ptcp. *šāḇeyhā* in 1:27 is admittedly disputed. Is the reference not rather to those returning home from abroad?[184] Given the juxtaposition to the "rebels and sinners" in 1:28, however, the translation "his converted ones" remains the most likely.[185]

The announcement that Yahweh "will come down to fight upon Mt. Zion" and that Assyria will be defeated (31:4-9) provokes the only real summons to repent and return in Proto-Isaiah, a summons borne by the assurance that "on that day all of you shall throw away your idols of silver and idols of gold" (v. 7).

4. *Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Obadiah.* The theme of "returning to God" is not attested in Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Obadiah or in the work of their redactors.

Micah uses the root *šwb* only twice. In justifying the announcement of disaster, this root cryptically confirms the correspondence between guilt and punishment: "for as the wages of a prostitute she gathered them, and as the wages of a prostitute they shall again be used" (Mic. 1:7), referring to the stones and foundational walls of Samaria or — in the present context — to cultic idols and images. In 2:8 the qal passive participle in the construct state represents the prep. *min.*[186] The insertion in 5:2(3)[187] associates the birth of the promised future ruler with the return of the "rest of his kindred to the people of Israel." In 7:19 *šwb* functions as a *verbum relativum.*

Nah. 2:3(2) uses *šwb* transitively as in the expression *šûḇ šᵉḇûṯ.* In its present context, the verse promises that Yahweh will "restore the majesty of Jacob, as well as the

---

181. See M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 197.

182. Wolff, *Hosea,* 232.

183. See 3.b above.

184. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1983), 45, with n. 36 and reference to 35:10.

185. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 61.

186. JM, §121n.

187. W. H. Schmidt, "Die Ohnmacht des Messias," *KuD* 15 (1969) 24 with n. 10; a different view is taken by H. Seebass, *Herrscherverheissungen im AT. BThS* 19 (1992), 44-45, 49.

The discussion in 3:1 also articulates the view that because repentance and return are impossible, judgment is unavoidable. On the basis of the marriage regulations in Dt. 24:1-4, which prohibit returning to one's earlier wife if she has in the meantime married another, Jeremiah denies that his listeners still have the opportunity to turn around or to return to Yahweh: "You have played the whore with many lovers; and would you return to me?" Such a return is already excluded by the people's own guilt, by their breach of the first commandment: "Though you wash yourself with lye and use much soap, the stain of your guilt is still before me" (Jer. 2:22).

The liturgy in 14:1–15:4, whose authenticity is admittedly disputed,[192] illustrates this harsh position. Even though the people, differently than in Hos. 6:1ff., do indeed admit their guilt (Jer. 14:7,20) and thus agree with the prophet's accusation that "their transgressions are many, their apostasies are great" (5:6), God refuses to hear their cry (14:12; 15:1-2). The prophet is even prohibited from petitioning God to "turn away your wrath from them" (14:11; 15:1; 18:20). At the same time, God's response makes clear that the people's confession of guilt is in fact nothing more than a "wavering back and forth" (14:10; cf. 2:25,26-27; 3:4-5). The people's change, as in Hos. 6:1ff., is merely superficial. There is no plea for forgiveness, nor is any genuine willingness to change discernible. Assertions such as "you, O Yahweh, are in the midst of us" (Jer. 14:9), picking up on the Zion tradition, show that the people still have not recognized the seriousness of their situation.

The summons "put on sackcloth, lament and wail: 'The fierce anger of Yahweh has not turned away from us'" (4:8) picks up an altered form of the refrain from the response poem in Isa. 9:4ff.(5ff.); 5:25ff.; here Jeremiah perseveres in his proclamation of disaster and opposes the vox populi, which amid calm times claims: "I am innocent; surely his anger has turned from me" (Jer. 2:35). Later editors then expand the formulation *lō' šûḇ ḥ^arôn 'ap-yhwh min* commensurate with the prophet's intention: "until he has executed and accomplished the intents of his mind" (23:20; 30:24).

b. Whereas Jeremiah himself views judgment as inevitable and unavoidable — "for I have spoken, I have purposed; I have not relented nor will I turn back *(hēšîḇ min)*" (4:28b LXX) — the Dtr redaction of the book of Jeremiah understands the prophet's absolute message of doom as a final attempt to get the people to return: "It may be that when the house of Judah hears of all the disasters that I intend to do to them, all of them may turn from their evil ways *(šûḇ middarkô hārā'â)*, so that I may forgive their iniquity and their sin" (36:3; cf. v. 7; 26:3). This understanding of the prophetic oracle of disaster is formulated programmatically in the reflection in 18:7-9, which considers God's actions from a universal perspective, trying to articulate them as a rule: "At one moment I may declare concerning a nation or a kingdom that I will pluck up and break down and destroy it, but if that nation . . . turns from its evil, I will change my mind about the disaster that I intended to bring on it" (vv. 7-8). Because the editors do not believe that the unconditional nature of the future proclamation necessarily excludes the intention to prompt a return, they are able to present the prophet as one who sum-

192. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25*, 178ff.

misleading" (Lam. 2:14). Although the verse does indeed leave no doubt that Israel was guilty, it holds those prophets responsible for the lack of understanding of that guilt and for the ultimate imposition of judgment. The redactors counter such views by pointing out that "the people cannot be excused, because they had been warned."[197]

Is this Dtr summons to return directed beyond those immediately addressed, i.e., to the readers of the text as well? Although this interpretation is often proposed,[198] it does at least go beyond the actual wording of the verses in question, which merely present the possibility of avoiding imminent judgment; as such, they remain entirely within the framework of the preexilic situation.

c. Although in his demonstration of guilt Jeremiah excludes any possibility that Judah/Jerusalem might return (3:1; 5:3; 8:4-5), in picking up and developing Hosea's oracle of salvation (Hos. 11:8-9; cf. 2:16-17[14-15]) he is able to call out to the northern kingdom, which has already suffered the consequences of judgment: "Return, faithless *(m^ešûḇâ)* Israel. . . . I will not look on you (any longer) in anger, for I am merciful. . . . I will not be angry forever" (Jer. 3:12; developed in 31:2-3[?],4,5a,15,16a,18-20[199]). As in Hosea's message, here salvation is bound not to conditions but rather solely to God's own transformation such that the summons to return acquires the character of an invitation to seize God's mercy and allow it to exercise its power: "Return, O faithless *(šôḇāḇîm)* children, I will heal your faithlessness" (3:22, picking up Hos. 14:2ff.[1ff.]; imitated in the post-Dtr 3:14[200]).

By contrast, the secondarily inserted[201] comparison of the two sisters in 3:6ff., which with the address *m^ešûḇâ yiśrāʾēl* draws from v. 12, with v. 7 from Hos. 2:8ff.(6ff.) and v. 10 from Jer. 3:4-5, justifies the summons to return by pointing out how "faithless Israel has shown herself less guilty than false Judah" (v. 11); in this way it explains why despite 3:1 Jeremiah is indeed able to issue a summons to return. At the same time, the section makes clear that the discussion in 3:1 refers to Judah/Jerusalem, while 3:12 refers to the former northern kingdom.

For Jeremiah, as already for Hosea or for the latter's pupils (Hos. 14:3[2]), genuine repentance and return requires an understanding of one's own guilt (Jer. 3:13). Such understanding comes to exemplary expression in the lament of Ephraim, which is framed by assurances of mercy (31:16a,18-20). Here the petition "let me return so that I can return" (v. 18) shows once more that "'return' or 'conversion' . . rather than being a human accomplishment, is God's work . . . God's own actions stand at the beginning. Return must be petitioned."[202]

---

197. W. H. Schmidt, *OT Intro.* (Eng. trans., New York, 1984), 144.

198. Thiel, *Jer 26–45,* 4; K. Koch, *The Prophets* (2 vols.; Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1984), II, 31-32; Jeremias, *Reue Gottes,* 75-80.

199. See N. Kilpp, *Niederreissen und Aufbauen. Das Verhältnis von Heilsverheissung und Unheilsverkündigung bei Jeremia und im Jeremiabuch. BThS* 13 (1990), 133ff., 156ff.

200. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25,* 85, 91-93.

201. Ibid., 83ff.; Kilpp, *Niederreissen,* 172ff.

202. H. J. Boecker, *Klagelieder. ZBK* 21 (1985), 95, regarding the adoption of 31:18 in Lam. 5:21.

Does the conditional oracle of salvation "if you return, O Israel, you may return to me" (4:1) come from Jeremiah? It almost sounds like a response to Ephraim's petition, "let me return so that I can return" (31:18), and exhibits prophetic structure, though the continuation in vv. 1b-2 raises doubts.[203] The promises of a return or of guidance for a return are probably not Jeremianic (30:10 = 46:27; 31:8,16bβ,17bβ; as a summons to seize the opportunity for return offered by God in 31:21-22).[204]

d. In his oracle of salvation to Judah/Jerusalem (24*; 29:4-7; 32:1ff.) Jeremiah does not use the root *šwb*. The Dtr redactor was the first hand to introduce it with the promise: "I will give them a heart to know that I am Yahweh; and they shall be my people and I will be their God, for they shall return to me with their whole heart" (24:7). The announcement "I will make an everlasting covenant with them, never to draw back from doing good to them" (Jer. 32:40), recalls Isa. 55:3 (cf. 61:8) and Gen. 17:7,13(P) and is perhaps only post-Dtr Both promises conclude that Israel is not capable of returning on its own initiative. Moreover, the redaction adds the assurance of the return of the exiles missing from Jeremiah himself (Jer. 23:3; 23:7-8 = 16:14-15; 24:6; 29:10; 30:3; 32:37; 42:12 [text?]; cf. 29:14 [post-Dtr]; also 12:15) or of the temple utensils (27:16,22, picking up and correcting 28:3,4,6).

6. *Ezekiel.* In the book of Ezekiel the occurrences of *šwb* in the sense of "return" are concentrated in chs. 18 and 33. The oracle in Ezk. 18:1ff. responds to what is more an expression of resignation than a genuine questioning of God. In stating that "the parents have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (v. 2; cf. Jer. 31:29),[205] with a reference to the responsibility each generation must accept, it discloses a future that is not always merely predetermined by the past (v. 20). The continuation in vv. 21ff. (cf. 33:10-20) emphasizes the personal responsibility of each individual and offers the opportunity for return and for new life: "Have I any pleasure in the death of the wicked? . . . and not rather that they should turn from their ways and live?" (v. 23). The conclusion in vv. 30b-32 issues the summons to seize precisely this opportunity: "Repent and turn from all your transgressions."

Although this oracle presupposes Ezekiel's own message of salvation, defending it against the listeners' resignation, it probably does not come from Ezekiel himself, at least not its second part. What for Ezekiel can only be God's own work, namely, the creation of a new heart and a new spirit (11:19; 36:26), 18:31 now turns into Israel's own task.

In a kind of second calling (cf. 3:19-20), 33:1-9 expands the prophetic office to include that of a guard or sentinel. The prophet is to pass along to the wicked God's judgment, "you shall surely die," thus giving them opportunity to "turn from their ways." This oracle integrates the offer of return and rescue in 18:1ff. and 33:10-20 into the

---

203. Kilpp, *Niederreissen,* 169-70.

204. See ibid., 113ff., 143, 152ff.

205. See in this regard A. Schenker, "Saure Trauben ohne stumpfe Zähne. Bedeutung und Tragweite von Ez 18 und 33:10-20 oder ein Kapitel alttestamentlicher Moraltheologie," *FS D. Barthélemy. OBO* 38 (1981), 449-70.

siderations strongly suggest that the call to repentance and return does not in fact represent the essential element linking the proclamation of the various classical prophets.[211]

Calls to repent and return appear first in the oracles of salvation, where one finds that conversion is not the condition for the reception of salvation; rather, the promised salvation is itself the presupposition or grounding of conversion. As such an invitation, the admonition is clearly dependent on the oracle of salvation.[212]

Calls to repent and return that place the people before the alternative of salvation and disaster appear first in the redactional strata. Although they do indeed reinterpret the prophetic message, they remain connected with it in that their demonstrations of guilt and declaration of judgment draw attention to the people's own failure to hear.

VIII. Deuteronomy. "Return to Yahweh" was not originally a theme of Deuteronomy. Although the root *šwb* does occasionally appear in Dtn and Dtr strata in theological contexts (Dt. 13:18[17]; 17:16; 23:15[14]; 28:60,69[29:1]),[213] it does not appear with the meaning "repent, return" until two late Dtr addenda (4:29-31; 30:1-10).[214]

1. *Theological Contexts.* No unified use of *šwb* that might cover all passages is discernible in 13:18(17); 17:16; 23:15; 28:60,69(29:1), the meaning shifting rather with the theological context in which the root appears. Dt. 13:18(17) stipulates that in executing the ban on a city that has fallen away from Yahweh (vv. 13-15[12-14]), nothing "devoted to destruction" is to be withheld "so that Yahweh may turn from his fierce anger and show you compassion." The expression *šwb mēḥ*ᵃ*rôn 'ap* with Yahweh as subject occurs once in an earlier tradition (Josh. 7:26) and then recurs twice in Dtr verses (Ex. 32:12; 2 K. 23:26).[215] The expression also appears in Jon. 3:9 and Ps. 85:4 LXX. Given the distribution of these passages, it can hardly be viewed as a specifically Dtn/Dtr expression.

Hence there is no reason to ascribe Dt. 13:18abα¹(17abα¹) to the Dtr redaction.[216] Although the clause was not part of the earlier core of the commandment,[217] it did belong to the preexilic material. The first Dtr part is the continuation in v. 18bα²β (17bα²β), as discernible in the readoption of the root *rḥm* as an addendum and in the Dtr diction in the reference to the patriarchal oath.[218]

The expression appears in the story of Achan's theft (Josh. 7) in reference to pre-

211. Wolff, *Studien zur Prophetie,* 41.

212. Wolff, *GSAT,* 144.

213. See VIII.1 below.

214. See VIII.2 below.

215. On the origin of the section Ex. 32:7-14, which is probably to be understood as Dtr rather than as "(proto-) Dtn/late preexilic" (so Jeremias, *Reue Gottes,* 61-62), cf. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 244; W. H. Schmidt, *Göttinger Predigtmeditationen* 38 (1984) 241-42 with n. 2; C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot. BBB* 62 (²1987), 66ff., esp. 128-32, 144-47.

216. See T. Römer, *Israels Väter. OBO* 99 (1990), 167ff.

217. G. Seitz, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium. BWANT* 93 (1971), 144ff.

218. See N. Lohfink, *Die Väter Israels im Deuteronomium. OBO* 111 (1991), 73-74.

cisely the transgression that Dt. 13:18(17) seeks to exclude, namely, the withholding of things "devoted to destruction," though one difference here is unmistakable. Whereas in Dt. 13 it is the breach of the first commandment that prompts God's wrath, which can then be turned away only by a strict implementation of the ban, in Josh. 7 it is the theft itself of the banned goods that ignites God's anger (v. 1) and must subsequently be punished (v. 26). Hence these two passages were probably not linked in tradition.

Whereas Josh. 7:26 merely ascertains that God turns from his "burning anger," Dt. 13:18(17) explicates what is associated with that turn. It basically corresponds to God's return to his concern and care for Israel, something experienced in the people's increase. By contrast, Ex. 32:7-14 develops God's turn from his wrath more reservedly as his decision not to carry through his plans for destruction. Moses entreats Yahweh to "turn from your fierce wrath," recalling Yahweh's oath to the patriarchs (v. 13; cf. Dt. 13:18b[17b]), and though Yahweh does not forgive Israel's sin, he does "change his mind about the disaster that he planned to bring on his people" (v. 14; cf. Ps. 106:22). Hence God's decision not to turn "from his great wrath, by which his anger was kindled," means essentially that his decision to visit destruction remains in effect (2 K. 23:26-27).

The law regarding kingship in Dt. 17 stipulates that "he must not acquire many horses for himself" (v. 16), thereby restricting — commensurate with prophetic criticism of trust in one's own strength (Isa. 2:7; 30:15-17; Hos. 10:13f.; etc.) — the king's ability to develop his military.[219] A later addendum then explicates: "or return the people to Egypt in order to acquire more horses, since Yahweh has said to you, 'You must never return that way again.'" Is this regulation condemning the (albeit unattested) practice of paying for Egyptian horses (1 K. 10:28) by supplying soldiers?[220] The addendum is probably to be understood in a much more basic sense as directing itself against the kings' pro-Egyptian politics, which were already a target of prophetic criticism. It condemns the return to Egypt to obtain help and all trust in battle horses and chariots (Isa. 31:1; cf. 30:2) as a reversal of God's historical guidance.[221] The people's return to Egypt, i.e., a voluntary subjugation to their former oppressors, contradicts God's salvific will (as a possible proof text for Dt. 17:16b, see Ex. 13:17 E?[222]).

Dt. 23:15b, which together with v. 1 constitutes the later framework of the regulations for war,[223] once again inculcates the urgency of keeping the military camp pure; failure to abide will result in Yahweh turning away, i.e., in military defeat.

---

219. See M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972), 281; Zobel, *Prophetie und Deuteronomium,* 121-30.

220. C. Steuernagel, *Das Deuteronomium. HKAT* I/3 (^{2}1923), 118.

221. See Zobel, *Prophetie und Deuteronomium,* 143-47.

222. D. E. Skweres, *Die Rückverweise im Buch Deuteronomium. AnBibl* 79 (1979), 194; a different view is taken by N. Lohfink, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischer Literatur. SBAB* 12 (1991), 143-45, who refers to Hos. 11:5 MT(!).

223. See Seitz, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien,* 160.

Dt. 28:58-68, which is already looking back at Deuteronomy itself as a "book" (vv. 58,61) and thus represents a "very late stratum,"[224] admonishes that if the people do not obey Yahweh, "he will bring back upon you *(hēšîḇ bᵉ)* all the diseases of Egypt" (v. 60). This threat, which may have been prompted by Am. 4:10,[225] presupposes the earlier Yahwistic as well as the more recent Priestly portrayal according to which Israel was not affected by the plagues. Verse 68, picking up Hosea's oracle of disaster (Hos. 8:13; 9:3; 11:5; cf. 9:6; 11:11), announces that if the people are disobedient, Yahweh will indeed return them to Egypt. The postscript, "by a route that I promised you would never see again," recalls Dt. 17:16b and perhaps Ex. 14:13 (J)[226] and thus betrays the real issue. By placing the assurance of salvation under the condition of obedience, the redactors mediate between the older tradition of election, which did not contain any possibility of such a revocation, and the radical message of the prophets.

2. *"Return."* The theme "return to God" first enters Deuteronomy in 4:29-31; 30:1-10. Both addenda presuppose postexilic circumstances by referring to the dispersion of Israel among the nations (4:29; 30:1,3-4) and may, given their shared language and intention, come from the same hand.[227] Because both the form and the content of the two sections are commensurate with proclamations, designating them "calls to return" is not really accurate. The redactor, speaking in the 1st person of Moses, expresses the assurance that in the distress resulting from judgment, Israel will indeed return to Yahweh (4:30), whereupon Yahweh will restore the people's fortunes (30:1ff.), an assurance nourished entirely from the prophetic tradition.[228]

Hosea announces impending judgment by pointing out the futility of pilgrimages: "With their flocks and herds they shall go to seek Yahweh, but they will not find him; he has withdrawn from them" (Hos. 5:6; cf. Am. 8:12); by contrast, Dt. 4:29a reverses this announcement of disaster by promising to those who have suffered through judgment that if they seek Yahweh, they will indeed find him again. The model for this assertion is probably the redactional verse Jer. 29:13, since the expression "seek Yahweh" *(dāraš/biqqēš)* and the juxtaposition "seeking-finding" *(māṣā')* is singular in Deuteronomy and the Dtr History.[229]

The argumentation in Dt. 4:29b, "you will seek him . . . in your distress" (so several Sam. mss.), picks up Hos. 5:15, "in their distress they will seek me," combining this anticipation with Dt. 6:5, "with all your heart, and with all your soul," corresponding to the unconditional proclamation in 4:30 (cf. 30:8), which like Isa. 9:12(13) (cf. Hos.

---

224. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 176.

225. See VII.1,2 above.

226. See Skweres, *Rückverweise,* 193-94.

227. Knapp, 91-97, 154-57.

228. See Zobel, *Prophetie und Deuteronomium,* 61ff., 99ff.

229. W. H. Schmidt, "'Suchet den Herrn, so werdet ihr leben.' Exegetische Notizen zum Thema 'Gott suchen' in der Prophetie," *Ex orbe religionum. FS G. Widengren. Studies in the History of Religions/Numen Sup* 21-22 (1972), I, 137-38; Knapp, 91; a different view is taken by Kilpp, *Niederreissen,* 65-66.

of its own age makes it doubtful that it came from the Chronicler; it more likely represents a post-Dtr corrective.[243] The goal of the prophets' futile warnings was a turning back to Yahweh (v. 26). At the same time the author explicates what he means, namely, a turning back to the law *(tôrâ),* to the totality of the "ordinances by the observance of which a person shall live" (v. 29). This view concludes the reinterpretation of the prophets into proclaimers of the law (cf. also Dnl. 9:6,10) started in the Dtr History and in the Dtr redaction of the book of Jeremiah.[244]

With Solomon's prayer at the temple dedication in 1 K. 8, the Chronicler adopts the expectation that Yahweh's judgment will bring about repentance and return; it also adopts the hope, expressed as a petition, that the people will be led back to the land (2 Ch. 6:24-25 par. 1 K. 8:33-34), their blessings restored (2 Ch. 6:26-27 par. 1 K. 8:35-36), and their sins forgiven (2 Ch. 6:36-39 par. 1 K. 8:46-50).[245] The Chronicler does, however, go beyond his predecessor in adding a response from God expressly assuring the fulfillment of the petition (2 Ch. 7:13-15). If the people will but "turn from their wicked ways," God will "forgive their sin and heal their land" (v. 14). Here the strict doctrine of requital determining the Chronicler's portrayal of history also shapes the theme of "return" in that a turning away from God inevitably results in judgment (v. 19), while a return to God means salvation (15:1-7; Neh. 1:8-9, freely paraphrasing Dt. 30:1-4). In its second part the Chronicler's History attests the fulfillment of the prophetic promise of return (Ezra 2:1 par. Neh. 7:6; cf. Ezra 6:21; Neh. 8:17).

XI. Exilic and Postexilic Prophets.

1. *Deutero-Isaiah.* As in the preexilic prophets, so also in Deutero-Isaiah the summons to return emerges from, is shaped by, and acquires its meaning from the proclamation of salvation: "return to me, *for* I have redeemed you" (Isa. 44:22b). The prophet counters the hopelessness of the exiles who believe God has forgotten them and that because of past sins they will have no future; the prophet summons them to recall what God means and has done for Israel (vv. 21,22a). Here the idea of return acquires a different meaning than, e.g., in Dtr parenesis or in 55:7 (probably secondary).[246] The reference is not to turning away from foreign gods and back to obedience to God's commandments, but rather a renunciation of precisely this hopelessness and a return to trust in the assurance of salvation; just as God himself will return to Zion (52:8), so also will the exiles, "the ransomed of Yahweh," return (51:11). With this message the prophet fulfills the commission he received as God's servant, namely, "to bring Jacob back to Yahweh" (*šwb* pilel) and "to restore the survivors of Israel" (*šwb* hiphil) (49:5-6).[247]

---

243. A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Nehemia. KAT* XIX/2 (1987), 129.
244. See IX and VII.5.c above.
245. See J. D. Levenson, "The Paronomasia of Solomon's Seventh Petition," *HAR* 6 (1982) 133-35.
246. See C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 288.
247. See in this regard H.-J. Hermisson, "Israel und der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja," *ZTK* 79 (1982) 9-11, 19-21.

theologically significant in that it keeps alive the hope that the redeemer will "turn away godlessness from Jacob."

3. *Zechariah.* Whereas Zechariah himself picks up the message of exilic prophecy in promising without qualification that Yahweh will once again turn to Jerusalem with compassion (Zech. 1:16) and return to Zion (8:3), the secondary framework (1:1-16) makes this promise dependent on the people's own return to Yahweh: "Return to me . . . and I will return to you" (v. 3). In so doing, it no longer grounds the summons to return in the message of salvation itself, something characterizing the prophets from Hosea to Trito-Isaiah as well as their schools.

The author motivates this admonition by referring to the fate of the fathers, who did not heed it (v. 4b) and whom only judgment could move to return to Yahweh (vv. 5-6; cf. Dnl. 9:4).[251] The penitential sermon even picks up the exact wording of the Dtr and Jeremianic-Dtr understanding of prophecy (cf. 2 K. 17:13-14; Jer. 18:11-12; 25:5,7; 26:3-4; 35:15; 36:3,7, etc.), but then takes it even further. In the Dtr History and the book of Jeremiah, the prophetic summons to return served the demonstration of guilt. In Zech. 1:3 it addresses the contemporary situation, the redactors aiming at altering the behavior of their present listeners, namely, that they "return from your evil ways and from your evil deeds" (v. 4).

The expression *šûḇ 'el* with Yahweh as subject and Israel as the goal of the return or of God's renewed attention is found only in 2 Ch. 30:6; Zech. 1:3; and Mal. 3:7. The passages' almost verbatim agreement raises the question concerning which has priority. Because Zech. 1:16 *(šaḇtî lîrûšālayim)* and 8:3 *(šaḇtî 'el-ṣîyôn)* make the expression comprehensible, it probably derives originally from the book of Zechariah itself, with 2 Ch. 30:6 and Mal. 3:7 representing secondary adoptions. On the other hand, the formulations in Zech. 1:16 and 8:3 may in their own turn have been prompted by the people's petition, "turn back" (Isa. 63:17; cf. Ps. 80:15[14]; 90:13).

Zech. 1:1-6 also exhibits relationships with the Chronicler's History (cf. esp. 2 Ch. 30:6-7). Are these connections dependent on the Dtr History or on the Dtr redaction of the book of Jeremiah as a common root? Or does Zech. 1:1-6 already presuppose the Chronicler's theology? Given the dependence of 2 Ch. 30:6 on Zech. 1:3, the former seems more likely. The secondary framework of the book of Zechariah should be viewed as deriving from a proto-Chronicler rather than from the Chronicler in the narrower sense.

The second part of the book of Zechariah exhorts the Jews deported en masse to Egypt by Ptolemy I in 312 B.C.E.[252] to "return 'in hosts' (?),[253] O prisoners of hope" (9:12a). Because this exhortation is framed by a proclamation of salvation (vv. 11,12bβ

251. A different view is taken by Beuken, 86-88, who with J. Rothstein, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. Studien zur Sacharjaprophetie und zur jüdischen Geschichte im ersten nachexilischen Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1910), understands v. 6b as an historical remark regarding the reaction of Zechariah's listeners.

252. A. Deissler, *Zwölf Propheten III. NEB* 21 (1988), 297.

253. See *HAL*, s.v.

[“I will restore to you double”],13ff.), it is not a condition but rather an invitation to risk the future trusting in God’s promise. Later the return itself (10:9) is explicitly identified as God’s own deed (vv. 6,10), articulating the hope that this return will also reunite the northern and southern kingdoms.

The third part of the book of Zechariah returns to the proclamation of disaster, announcing judgment with the expression *hēšîḇ yaḏ ʿal* (Zech. 13:7; cf. Isa. 1:25; Am. 1:8); unlike the preexilic prophets, however, this author is trying to bring about a “refining” of the people (Zech. 13:8-9; but cf. Isa. 1:25-26).

4. *Malachi.* In the face of his contemporaries’ doubts and disappointment at the absence of fulfillment, Malachi maintains belief in the steadfastness of God’s love for his people (Mal. 1:2) and in the reliability of the promise (v. 5), albeit making its realization dependent on the people’s own return: “Return to me, and I will return to you” (3:7aβ; cf. Zech. 1:3).[254] The difference over against earlier prophets is unmistakable. Although the exhortation to return is indeed issued within the horizon of the proclamation of salvation (“for I, Yahweh, do not change,” v. 6a), the author abandons the strict justification (“for”) of the admonition with the salvific oracle and thus makes the people’s return to Yahweh the prerequisite for salvation itself (vv. 10-12). The background to this shift is the experience that Israel, too, has not changed (v. 6b, alluding to Hos. 12:4,7,12[3,6,11]) and that the disobedience predominating since the time of the ancestors has remained even into the present (v. 7aα). The context then explicates in the characteristically Malachian form of dialogue what such return actually means; picking up the question of the addressees (“how shall we return?” v. 7b), the author cautiously (vv. 8ff.) presents the answer: “bring the full tithe into the storehouse” (v. 10).

Mal. 2:6 praises Levi for having “turned *(hēšîḇ)* many from iniquity” through “true instruction”; as such, he becomes a standard against which the present priests are found wanting (vv. 8-9). Mal. 1:4 and 3:18 use *šwb* as a *verbum relativum.* In 3:24(4:6) a later redactor hopes that Elijah might return and “turn the hearts of parents to their children and the hearts of children to their parents.” “Is not the unity of the generations a basic condition for the transmission of the faith (Exod. 13:8, 14; etc.)?”[255]

5. *Joel.* The summons to return occupies a central position in Joel’s proclamation. To the question raised by the imminent day of Yahweh (Joel 1:5), namely, “who can endure it?” (2:11), the prophet responds that the invitation to return remains valid “even now” (2:12-14), opening up the possibility of permanent deliverance from the final judgment (2:19-27; cf. 3:5[2:32]).

Picking up Dtn/Dtr language, the demand is for a return “with all your heart” (v. 12a), i.e., a radical, transformational “aligning of one’s life.”[256] Commensurate with Joel’s characteristic high estimation of the cult (1:9,13-14,16; 2:14), such transforma-

---

254. See XI.3 above.
255. Schmidt, *OT Intro.,* 281.
256. Wolff, *Joel and Amos,* 49.

26:3; 36:3,7; Ex. 32:14, Dtr). Here the author prepares for the idea that the book tries to articulate: the possibility of deliverance contained in the confession in Joel 2:13b applies not only to Israel but to all the nations (Jon. 4:2). At the same time he holds up to Israel, which believes this confession applies to it alone, a mirror in that it consciously presents the foreign king as Jehoiakim's counterpart (cf. 3:6-9 with Jer. 36:21ff.). He preserves far more strongly than does Jer. 18:7-8 the notion of God's inviolability by qualifying with the word "perhaps" the belief that "God may relent and change his mind" (Jon. 3:9a par. Joel 2:14a). Hence although return is indeed a prerequisite for God's "self-control" (Jeremiah), the latter is by no means a necessary consequence of return, remaining instead God's free act. At the same time, the continuation illustrates the Ninevites' realization of their own guilt by picking up Ex. 32:12 in describing God's renunciation of destruction as a turn "from his fierce anger" (Jon. 3:9b).

Moreover, Jon. 3:5a,8b,9-10 associate the verbs "believe" *(heʾᵉmîn)* and "return" with one another for the first time. Is the author combining Isa. 7:9b with 30:15 here, albeit understanding the two terms far less comprehensively than does Isaiah? That is, the turning away from iniquity, from "the violence that is in their hands" (Jon. 3:8bβ), and trust in God's willingness to exercise "self-control" circumscribe only certain aspects of that which Isaiah understands by "return, turning away" and "faith," namely, the abandonment of the illusion that one might endure by one's own power, and the willingness to risk one's existence solely on the basis of God's promise.

XII. Psalms.

1. The imperative of *šûḇ* is also a topos in the language of the Psalms.[263] Since the real distress affecting both the individual and the people is abandonment by God, the logical petition is the cry "turn back!" (Ps. 6:5[4]; 80:15[14]; 90:13). The same vb. *šwb* is then also used in concretizing this petition in the plea for restoration (60:3[1] pilel; 80:4,8,20[3,7,19] hiphil; 85:5[4] qal = hiphil; cf. 126:14 *K* [cj. *BHS*]) or in the wish that "the downtrodden not have to return in shame" (74:21; cf. 132:10). The conviction that Yahweh "will repay all according to their deeds *(hēšîḇ)*" (Prov. 24:12; cf. Ps. 7:11-17[10-16]) recurs as both a petition (28:4; 79:12; 94:2 hiphil) and as an expression of trust (94:23) and thanksgiving (18:21,25[20,24]). While the petition is supported by the assurance that enemies will withdraw (*šûḇ ʾāḥôr,* 56:10[9]; cf. 6:11[10]), thanksgiving hymns extol such withdrawal as God's own deed (9:4[3]; cf. v. 18[17]). After experiencing the kind of aid for which human beings cannot repay God (116:12), the petitioner exhorts his soul, i.e., himself, "return . . . to your rest" (116:7), abiding in the trust that through his guidance God will bring the soul (the self, person, life) back, i.e., will restore a person to peace with himself (23:3 pilel; cf. 51:14[12]). Later piety associates this trust with God's own guidance (19:8[7]; cf. 119:59). In Ps. 51 the psalmist associates the petition for a "clean heart" and a "new and steadfast spirit" (v. 12[10]) with the vow to "teach transgressors your ways, so that sinners will return to you" (v. 15[13]).

---

263. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), on Ps. 6:5.

the admonition is issued within the horizon of a "too late," though one important difference does remain. Whereas the prophets use the sequence admonition-judgment to show that the people have forfeited any possibility of returning,[267] wisdom preserves its pedagogical intentions by prepositioning a question not only of accusation, but simultaneously of solicitation: "How long, O simple ones, will you love being simple?" (1:22; cf. vv. 20-21), then picking up the structure of the prophetic proclamation of salvation in motivating this summons with the assurance: "I will pour out my thoughts to you; I will make my words known to you" (v. 23b). Wisdom demands a decision between turning away *(mᵉšûḇâ)* and heeding (vv. 32-33), between disregarding or following wisdom instruction. Here the "too late" is yet a possibility, whereas in the prophetic oracle of disaster it is already a reality; the intention is to present the consequences of deciding wrongly and in so doing lend emphasis to the admonition itself.

2. *Job.* The theme of "return" appears in the dialogues of the book of Job. With the cry "turn" (Job 6:29), Job defends himself against his friends' attempts to reverse the act-consequence nexus and draw conclusions concerning his behavior from his fate, since he considers such reasoning a perversion *('wlh)* of what is right. His friends, however, do not understand (17:10), and instead in their own turn demand that Job himself return (22:23), interpreting the suffering that afflicts Job as God's command to return (36:8-10). "Only that ear that has first been opened to human beings is able to perceive God's warnings . . . and to understand that the goal of God's actions is for people to return, not that they be destroyed,"[268] though the frame narrative does maintain the correctness of Job's position over against that of his friends. In the discourses of Elihu the concentration of occurrences of *šwb* suggests that it also qualifies as a leitmotif.

The root *šwb* also appears in various expressions addressing the theme of human transitoriness (7:10; 10:21; 16:22; cf. 15:22), accepting it as a fate from the hand of God (1:21; 10:9; 30:23; 34:15; cf. 9:12; Ps. 90:3).

Graupner

3. *Sirach.* Sirach uses the root *šwb* 32 times, demonstrating thereby his almost Jeremianic facility with the root. Commensurate with the overall character of his book, he almost never uses *šwb* in secular contexts (but cf. Sir. 38:25: "how can one become wise . . . who drives cattle to the field and brings back oxen?"). The first occurrence in this book already exhibits a programmatic character: "Do not be ashamed to turn away from sin" (4:26), followed by "do not delay to turn back to him [God], and do not postpone it from day to day" (5:7). The background to these aphorisms, shaped as they are by sapiential judiciousness, is not the threatening prophetic imperative but rather the everyday observation that many things founder on convention. Sir. 8:5 tries to provide

---

267. Warmuth, 170.

268. H. M. Wahl, *Der gerechte Schöpfer. Eine redaktions- und theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchung der Elihu-Reden — Hiob 32–37. BZAW* 207 (1993), 107.

for such occasions by advising: "do not reproach one who is turning away from sin; remember that we all deserve punishment." Such statements betray a society with a depraved morality, one in which those who try to turn away from sin find themselves subjected to mockery.

Sirach also uses *šwb* in anthropological contexts to articulate how human beings return to dust (40:3,11), to the "mother of all the living" (40:1), and — unique in the OT and Apocrypha — to nothingness (41:10).

The form *hēšîḇ* is also used in rules for life, e.g., "do not let your hand be stretched out to receive and closed when it is time to return" (4:31). Sirach, too, uses *hēšîḇ* to address the themes of response and requital.

XIV. Anthropological Expressions. The root *šwb* appears several times in anthropological expressions.

1. The expression *šûḇ lᵉ/ʾel/ʿal ʿāpār,* "return to dust," has a long tradition. It is already used by the Yahwist (or JE) and has parallels in Akk. *târu ana epri*[269] and *ana ṭiṭi târu* in hymnic contexts with anthropological themes. After the Fall, human beings are sentenced to return to the ground *(ʾᵃḏāmâ)* and to dust *(ʿāpār)* (Gen. 3:19aβ,bβ). Although the contextual inclusion in the sentence of punishment imposed on sinful humankind has variously prompted interpreters to view this "return to the ground" (v. 19aβ) similarly as punishment (v. 19bβ), the intention is more likely merely to make a statement regarding the nature of human beings. A subdivision of the parallel statement into a "peasant (Fellah) tradition and a nomad (Bedouin) tradition"[270] has not succeeded, though C. Dohmen has demonstrated that the expression "return to dust" represents a later addendum (R^P?).[271]

Similar statements in Job 34:15; Ps. 104:29; 146:4; Eccl. 3:20; and Sir. 40:3,11 date to a late period. Expressions with *hēšîḇ* are also of interest in this context (Job 10:9; Ps. 90:3) in that they express the omnipotence and omnicausality of the Creator.[272] These expressions reappear in the anthropological sections of the *Hodayoth* (1QH 10:4,12; 11:20; 12:26,31; 1QH fr. 1:4; 4:11), especially in what are known as the doxologies of the lowly, which focus on the frail, material nature of human beings, their lowliness and transitoriness. Their existence resides totally within the power of the Creator, their "being as dust" signaling their need for redemption. The Qumran *Hodayoth* find in these OT statements primarily an expression of the human sinfulness from which only God's mercy can deliver a person.

Although in view of the possible iterative meaning of *šwb* the expression *šûḇ lᵉ/ʾel/*

269. *CAD,* IV, 186.

270. J. Begrich, "Die Paradieserzählung. Eine literargeschichtliche Studie," *ZAW* 50 (1932) 93-116; G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1961), 94.

271. C. Dohmen, *Schöpfung und Tod. Die Entfaltung theologischer und anthropologischer Konzeptionen in Gen. 2/3. SBB* 17 (1988), 173-74.

272. See H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1974), 99-118 (§XII: Life and Death).

ʿal-ʿāpār can certainly be translated as "become dust again,"[273] given the parallel expressions with → בֶּטֶן *beṭen* and → שְׁאוֹל *šeʾôl* it is more likely to be rendered in the sense of return with a locative aspect. Human beings are taken from dust (1QH 12:27), consist of dust (Job 30:19), and return back to dust. Rarely does an element of judgment accompany such statements (1QH fr. 1:4; 4:11); instead, and again especially in Qumran, an element of hope can attach to the imagery of dust (1QH 3:21; 6:34), since such a return to dust does not remove a person from God's election (2:13; 14:15). Precisely the question borrowed from Ps. 8:5(4) (cf. 1QH 12:31-32) focuses on the unfathomable nature of the Creator's steadfast love for his creatures, in which case references to a "return to dust" also imply belief in the divine theo-economical order of creation that despite its rigid laws does represent the space in which God's freely choosing salvific activity is directed toward human beings (cf. Job 7:17; Ps. 8:5[4]; 144:3). Just as in the later OT period, so also in Qumran the hope in resurrection begins to develop at precisely this juncture (cf. 1QH 11:12-13),[274] though Ecclesiastes is unable to penetrate this far: "Because all must go to their eternal home . . . the pitcher is broken at the fountain, and the wheel broken at the cistern, and the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the breath returns to God who gave it" (Eccl. 12:5-7).

2. Only Job 1:21 refers metaphorically to "returning to my mother's womb" (cf. Ps. 139:12,15 as an antipode), naked and stripped of all possessions (cf. the replacement of *šwb* by *šwb* + *hālaḵ* in Eccl. 5:14[15]), possibly attesting chthonic-mythical traditions,[275] which from the perspective of depth psychology, however, may articulate primal human yearnings (cf. in this regard the "return to the mother of all the living" in Sir. 40:1[276]). Considering also the squatting or crouching position attested in some burials,[277] this metaphor may thus be trying to say little more than that the same essentially protective realm is present both at birth and at death.[278] "This return, of course, is to the earth, which in this context represents the mother's womb. Job 8:19b speaks similarly . . . about the emergence of future generations 'from the earth' of the preceding ones, demonstrating an understanding of the earth as fertile, thus completing the cycle of birth, death, and rebirth."[279]

3. The "return to *šeʾôl*" (Ps. 9:18[17]) can also only be understood metaphorically, since nowhere does the OT entertain the notion that human beings originated there. The discourse cycles in the book of Job have considered this theme extensively and

273. See C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. trans. 1984), 183, 204-5.
274. See in this regard K. Schubert, "Die Entwicklung der Auferstehungslehre von der nachexilischen bis zur frührabbinischen Zeit," *BZ* 6 (1962) 177-214.
275. M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* 15 (1965), 16.
276. → בטן *beṭen,* II, 97-98.
277. G. Ricciotti, "Et nu j'y retournerai (Job 1,21)," *ZAW* 67 (1955) 249-51.
278. F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (^{4}1983), 19.
279. H.-P. Müller, "Weisheitliche Deutungen der Sterblichkeit," *Mensch-Umwelt-Eigenwelt* (Stuttgart, 1992), 69-100, esp. 78.

noun *mšwb,* 8 *tšwbh,* 6 *šwbh,* and 1 the adj. *šwbb* (4Q443 1, 14). In about 10 instances the reading is uncertain. The root *twb* occurs about 20 times in the Aramaic Qumran writings.[285]

Determining trends or preferences is commensurately difficult, since one must take into account the generally unknown length of the scrolls. Given these uncertainties, one can offer only some figures regarding distribution (including the parallels from 4Q).

CD	55 times
1QS/1QSb	44
1QH	43
1QM	28
Wisdom texts	25
Pesharim	19
Psalm literature	10
Liturgical texts	9
Temple Scroll	7
4QMMT (including doublets)	5

The concentration of occurrences in legislative texts of the Qumran community is unmistakable, suggesting that *šwb* played a central role in the community rule

The Aramaic root *twb* is concentrated in Qumranic Enoch and testamental writings.

b. *Syntactical Observations.* Alongside a noticeably frequent absolute use of the verb, the Qumran authors also use the directional indicators already familiar from the OT, including *min, ʿal, ʾel, ʿaḏ,* and *lᵉ.* With few exceptions, the subject is a person in general, a specific person (esp. in disciplinary rules), or a group of persons ("sons of light," members of the *yaḥaḏ,* apostates, and many others). It is only in the directional goals insinuated for *šwb* that specific tendencies of the Qumran understanding emerge; such goals include *yaḥaḏ, miḏbar, hāʿammîm,* and especially *tôrâ/tôraṯ môšeh.*

One noticeable morphological feature is the utter absence of *šwb* in imperatives quite in contrast to the OT itself, where it occurs over 80 times. Holladay suggests that perhaps the Qumranites never issued the direct exhortation to "repent, return" because, after all, the community members had already taken this step.[286]

c. *Semantic Scope.* The semantic nuances of *šwb* are distributed equally across the various Qumran writings such that no one writing exhibits any discernibly limited semantic preference, suggesting that the use of *šwb* in Qumran did not develop any specialized meanings, though this does not exclude the possibility that certain tendencies do emerge. The *milḥāmâ* ("war") literature uses *šwb* primarily in the technical military sense. The Community Rule writings exhibit their inner relationship in that they con-

285. See Beyer, 721-22; on the syntax of the Aramaic passages in Qumran, see T. Muraoka, *Studies in Qumran Aramaic. AbrN Sup* 3 (1992), 117.

286. Review of Fabry, *Wurzel,* in *VT* 29 (1979) 368.

tain a concentration of ethical components in the sense of "turning" away from iniquity or to the *yaḥaḏ*, the Torah, the covenant, etc. The *Hodayoth* use *šwb* primarily in anthropological contexts (e.g., with reference to the "return to dust"), with simultaneous reference to the incapacity of human beings to justify themselves in the sense of "response." This often immediate juxtaposition of the most varied semantic nuances clearly shows that during the period when the Qumran writings were composed, *šwb* had lost virtually none of the wide semantic scope it displays in the OT. Nor certainly is any tendency to restrict the meaning to the aspect of "repentance" discernible. Taking as their point of departure various OT wordplays, some of these authors are even able to employ what are for us often obscure semantic nuances in using *šwb* with considerable linguistic virtuosity in developing what amount to moral-theological compendia (cf., e.g., 1QS 5:1-7a; CD 19:15-33; 20:13-34; cf. also 4QpPs37 2-3).

d. *Theological Use.* Because the secular use of *šwb* in Qumran exhibits no peculiarities, and because the theological use also largely follows OT models, in what follows I draw attention only to some features of its use that seem to be specific to Qumran.

(1) Even the apparently secular technical military meaning of *šwb* over large stretches of the *milḥāmâ* literature, including the inscriptions on standards and trumpets in the sense of a "retreat in battle" (1QM 3:10; 8:2,13, et passim), is ambiguous in that it can refer to tactical troop movements as well as to the fearful retreat of individuals from the eschatological battle, a sign of insufficient trust in God (15:9).

(2) One important feature specific to the Qumran writings is the association of *šwb* with the goal *yaḥaḏ* (1QS 5:22; 7:2,24; cf. also 7:17,19; 8:23; 9:1; CD 20:5). Even though the expressions "turn to/turn away from the community" refer first of all to movement in the locative sense, they imply much more. Entry into or exit from the community involves a life decision on the part of the probational member (cf. 1QS 5:22) accompanied by serious obligations. Hence any "turn to the community" must be viewed as an external sign of an inner turn; a turn away from the wicked priest in Jerusalem, from a sinful interpretation of the law, and from impurity is accompanied by a turn to radical obedience to the Torah and to subjugation to community discipline. Those who "turn away from the community" are viewed as traitors, false teachers, and idolaters who cling to evil and walk in the stubbornness of the hearts (cf. 1QS 1:17; 7:23; CD 19:34; 20:10,14). Once performed, this turn *to* the community should be continued in a turn *within* the community (4Q258 1, II, 2, *hmtndbym lšwb byḥd*).

(3) This turn within the community is accompanied by a plethora of synonyms in Qumran. It represents first of all a "conversion from all evil" *(rʿ, ʿwlh, pšʿ, ʿwn)* involving a separation from the community of injustice, commitment to God's will, and integration into the community with respect to *(bᵉ)* the law and possessions (1QS 5:1). Any turning away from sin is always simultaneously a turning back to the Torah, a self-binding to the divine will (4QpPs37 2-3), and access to true purity (1QS 5:14).[287] Turning away from sin constitutes the moral qualification informing the understanding of

287. See J. Gnilka, "Die essenischen Tauchbäder und die Johannestaufe," *RevQ* 3 (1961) 192.

"holiness" in Qumran.[288] Those who resist turning away from sin will be destroyed (4QpPs37 II, 4), falling prey to the repayment of the wicked (1QH 14:24). Those who turn from sin are those who truly keep God's covenant (CD 20:17; cf. 4Q266 2, II, 5) and perform atonement (4Q400 1, I, 16).

(4) The newly coined expression *šwb 'l twrh/twrt mwšh* occurs about 10 times in the Qumran writings, with a clear concentration in CD (CD 15:9,12; 16:1,4; 4Q266 17, I, 3; 1QS 5:8; 10:11; 4Q256 2, I, 7; 4QpPs^{a} 11:1; 4QpPs37 II, 2).[289] This "turn to the Torah" is generally accompanied by a ritual of acceptance into the community (CD 15:9), constituting thus the necessary presupposition for further participation in the instruction in the *mišpāṭîm* (l. 12). By all appearances this turn to the Torah included not only the Torah in the narrower sense (Pentateuch) but also the literature of the Rule and the Temple Scroll. In this respect it is remarkable that despite the extensive legal terminology in Qumran,[290] *tôrâ* is the only directional object of *šwb* (a similar situation can be observed with regard to → דרשׁ *dāraš;* cf. 1QS 6:6; CD 6:7, et passim). This expression obviously demonstrates the Torah-centered, nomistic orientation of ethical conversion specific to Qumran.

At present one cannot determine whether the peculiar, singular expression *šwb bmdrš* (4Q258 3, II, 1) belongs in this context.

(5) The "return from the wilderness of the peoples" (*šwb mmdbr h'mym,* 1QM 1:3; 4QpIsa^{a} [161] 5-6, 2; cf. also 4QpIsa^{e} [165] 5, 6) seems to be a typological and metaphorical statement seeking tendentiously to actualize Ezk. 20:35. In Qumran, too, the "wilderness of the peoples" seems to refer to the place of banishment from which the *gôlâ* of the sons of light now return in order to "camp in the wilderness of Jerusalem" (1QM 1:3). This metaphor refers to the great eschatological assembling of the Essene communities under the Teacher of Righteousness as the primary integrator.[291] Evidence in Arabic and Old South Arabic also confirms that *šwb* can indeed exhibit these semantic components. This action of assembling is followed by the march to Jerusalem and the battle against the nations (4QpIsa^{a} 5-6, 2). The expression *šby hmdbr,* "those turning in the wilderness" (4QpPs37 3, 1), is only indirectly related to this context (see below).

(6) 1QS 6:15 speaks about a "turn to the truth" *(šwb l'mt),* par. "turn away from all iniquity," as a fixed part of the novitiate period. The manual for overseers *('yš hpqyd)* views this turn as indispensable for final acceptance into the community, after which instruction in the community's own statutes commences. Here we encounter a fixed sequence that in varying terminology represents a permanent part of the rule writings. Since in Qumran the term *'emeṯ* implies notions specific to the community itself (the community as the embodiment of the *'emeṯ*), such "turning to the truth" in fact repre-

---

288. See R. Nötscher, "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften," *RevQ* 2 (1960) 330.

289. See in this regard H. Braun, "Beobachtungen zur Tora-Verschärfung im häretischen Spätjudentum," *TLZ* 79 (1954) 347-52.

290. See M. Limbeck, *Die Ordnung des Heils* (Düsseldorf, 1971), 119-90.

291. See H. Stegemann, "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für das Verständnis Jesu und des frühen Christentums," *BiKi* 48 (1993) 11.

g. *Theological Aspects of the Hophal.* The use of the hophal in Qumran follows OT use. It appears in connection with legal questions affecting property (CD 9:13) and in the statement that no one shall "dispute" the renown of the righteous (CD 6:4-6, as a midrash to Nu. 21:18).

h. *Theological Aspects of Nouns.* Whereas in the OT itself *mᵉšûḇâ* refers basically to "apostasy" from God, in Qumran (cf. 1QS 3:1) it refers to the specifically Qumranic understanding of "turning" as a "conversion of one's life" *(mšwb ḥy)* at the time of one's entry into the community. In the remaining 11 occurrences, the frequent incorporation into military contexts in 1QM (inscriptions on trumpets and field standards) is noteworthy. Here the term refers to tactical military retreat on the battlefield, but then especially to the retreat back to Jerusalem at the culmination of the eschatological battle (1QM 3:10b). It also refers to the withdrawal of mercy *(ḥsdym)* toward the wicked and thus to their ultimate destruction (4Q402 1, I, 23; 405 23, 7; uncertain readings).

In the Qumran writings the use of *tᵉšûḇâ* falls somewhere between OT usage and the rabbinical writings. In contrast to the OT models, the noun can also refer here to religious and moral conversion (CD 19:6); as such it also prepares the way for rabbinic usage (cf. Petuchowski).

The meaning of *šûḇâ* in its 6 occurrences in Qumran is still debated.[296] In the only reliable occurrence (1QS 3:3), in connection with entry regulations, obedience to the Torah, stubbornness of heart, and similar concerns, it refers almost certainly to the necessity of religious and moral conversion for active participation in the life of the community, and is the *conditio sine qua non* for perfection.

2. *Rabbinic Judaism.* E. Würthwein already observed how in the dialogue between the OT and the various Greek translations the terms *metanoéin* and *šwb* became increasingly synonymous.[297] Even though studies still need to be conducted, one can probably assume that this process also affected the semantic valence of *šwb* itself. A similar, probably also externally prompted semantic modification is discernible in the use of *šwb* in rabbinic literature. First these authors adopted the prophetic understanding of ethical and religious conversion or "turning," an understanding that initially remained determinative and that also passed from the verb to the noun *tᵉšûḇâ*. Indeed, the expression *ʿāśâ tᵉšûḇâ* eventually took over the function of the verb itself. This understanding of "turning" appears quite early in the most important texts, for example, in the fifth benediction of the *Shemoneh Esreh* (Amidah): "Blessed be you who take pleasure in conversion *(bitšûḇâ)*." Dietrich and Behm strongly emphasize that this terminology clearly refers to "conversion, turning around" rather than to "penitence, do penance."[298]

The rabbis had an extremely high estimation of such conversion or "turning" since among the seven things existing before creation it occupies the first position before even the Torah (Bab. *Ned.* 39b). Because of this immediate proximity, conversion or

296. See Fabry, *Wurzel,* 294-304.
297. *TDNT,* IV, 980-89.
298. Dietrich, 321, 324ff.; Behm, 991.

"turning" was now oriented primarily toward legal categories, eventually becoming the equivalent of obedience to the Torah. The idea of conversion as a turning to God is gradually overlaid by an association with (also ritual) penitence (Bab. *Sanh.* 103a). Here a whole spectrum of distinctions emerge extending from the kind of conversion that motivates a person at a deep level to the purely external exercise of penitence (Pirqe de Rabbi Eliezer 43).

Petuchowski draws attention to three aspects of *tᵉšûḇâ:*[299] first, the human potential for evil as well as for good as a prerequisite for conversion; second, the phenomenology of becoming conscious of one's sins and their consequences; and third, the synergy of God and human being. Finally, concerning the "doctrine of repentance" that developed up to Maimonides, see Goldstein and especially the extremely thorough presentation in Jacobs.

Fabry

299. Petuchowski, 175-85.

שָׁוָה *šāwâ;* שָׁוֶה *šāweh*

Contents: I. Root and Distribution. II. 1. Forms and Occurrences in the OT; 2. Parallel Terms; Expressions. III. General Use: 1. *šwh* I; 2. *šwh* II; 3. Aramaic. IV. Theological Considerations. V. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX

I. Root and Distribution. Current evidence suggests that the root *šāwâ* originated in West Semitic. It appears in South Semitic and especially in Northwest Semitic, where alongside various Hebrew occurrences one finds Aram. *šᵉwāʾ,* "be equal, the same," and Syr. *šᵉwāʾ,* "be even, level."[1] If Wieder is correct, then it may also be related

šāwâ. N. Avigad, "Excavations at Beth Sheʿarim, 1953," *IEJ* 4 (1954) 88-107, esp. 98-99; J. Barth, *Etymologische Studien* (Leipzig, 1893), esp. 66-67; A. Guillaume, "Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography: A Comparative Study IV," *AbrN* 4 (1963/64) 1-18, esp. 14; E. Jenni, *HP,* esp. 21, 35, 111, 240, 291; L. Krinetzki, "'Tal' und 'Ebene' im AT," *BZ* 5 (1961) 204-20; C. J. Labuschagne, *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the OT. POS* 5 (1966), esp. 29-57; S. Morag, "On Some Semantic Relationships," *FS H. L. Ginsberg. ErIsr* 14 (1978) 137-47; A. A. Wieder, "Ugaritic-Hebrew Lexicographical Notes," *JBL* 84 (1965) 160-64; → דמה *dāmâ (dāmāh),* III, 250-60; → כְּ *kᵉ,* VI, 1-7; → משׁל *māšal* I, IX, 64-67.

1. On various Arabic verbs cf. Barth, 66; *HAL,* IV, 1436. On Northwest Semitic cf. also *DNSI,* II, 1116-17; Avigad, 99.

some of the forms are difficult to understand and are textually uncertain. One such example is *šāwâ* I in the form *šiwwîṯî* in Isa. 38:13, which, unlike the other piel occurrences, is used absolutely here and is spelled *špwty* in 1QIsa[a] (cf. *BHS*); it is often altered to *šiwwa'tî*, "I cry (for help)," following Tg.[9] Similarly in Job 33:27 the form *šāwâ (lî)* is often altered because of the context (cf. *BHK;* but not in *BHS*). Finally, the peculiar form *ništāwâ* in Prov. 27:15 (see above) is sometimes changed to *nišwāṯâ* (cf. *BHK; BHS*). Among the piel forms of *šwh* II, the form *šiwwîṯî* in Ps. 119:30 and especially *y[e]šawweh* in Hos. 10:1 are uncertain and subject to various alterations (cf. *BHK; BHS*). Finally, the *K/Q* variants in the Aramaic text of Dnl. 5:21 betray an uncertain text. All these textual uncertainties make it difficult to come to a precise understanding of this word family.

The subst. *šāweh,* "plain," which Gen. 14:5 associates with the place name Kiriathaim *(šāwēh qiryāṯāyim),* is generally construed as a noun though understood as a local place name in 14:17. Even in the latter case, its form *šāwēh* is associated with *'ēmeq,* "valley" *('ēmeq šāwēh),* which H. Gunkel and C. Westermann render as the "Valley of Shaveh."[10] Nonetheless, one should probably not push the distinction in the two passages too far, especially because Sam. uses a definite article with *šāwēh* in 14:17 (cf. *BHS*). Moreover, the full compound *'ēmeq hammeleḵ,* "King's Valley," appended as an explanation in v. 17b (cf. 2 S. 18:18), constitutes the entire name, not just its second part *hammeleḵ,* "King's," here corresponding to the preceding *šāwēh,* a consideration that may well affect one's understanding of v. 5 (e.g., E. A. Speiser uses the rendering "Shaveh" not only in v. 17 but also in v. 5[11]).

2. *Parallel Terms; Expressions.* Among the few words semantically parallel to *šāwâ* I, the verb → דמה *dāmâ* I, "be like,"[12] is the most important (Isa. 40:25; 46:5; Lam. 2:13); other parallel terms include *dmm* polel, "calm"[13] (Ps. 131:2), and → משל *māšal* I, "compare (with)" (Isa. 46:5).[14] One characteristic feature of this verb is that it is often used with particles, including, in the qal, *'el* (Isa. 40:25), *b[e]* (Est. 7:4; Prov. 3:15; 8:11), *l[e]* (Est. 3:8; 5:13; Job 33:27); in the piel, *k[e]* (2 S. 22:34 par. Ps. 18:34[33]); and in the hiphil, *l[e]* (Isa. 46:5; Lam. 2:13; cf. Hos. 10:1). Negation is expressed by *lō'* in Prov. 3:15 and 8:11 (cf. Ps. 131:2; Isa. 28:25), and by *'ên* in Est. 3:8; 5:13; 7:4).

III. General Use. As already mentioned, this word family is represented in the OT almost exclusively by (Hebrew and Aramaic) verbs.[15]

---

9. Cf., e.g., *KBL*[2], 954; *HP,* 111; cf. III.1.

10. H. Gunkel, *Genesis. GHAT* I/1 ([9]1977), 285 [not in Eng. trans.]; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11. CC* (Eng. trans. 1984), in loc.

11. E. A. Speiser, *Genesis. AB* 1 (1964), 99-100; cf. also *BDB,* 1001.

12. See E. Jenni, "דמה *dmh* to be like," *TLOT,* I, 339-42.

13. → דמה *dāmâ (dāmāh)* II (III, 260-65).

14. See also Labuschagne, 29-30.

15. Concerning the sparse use of nouns, see II.1 above.

1. *šwh I.* Use of the vb. *šāwâ* I, which the parallel verbs *dāmâ, dmm,* and *māšal* I and the previously mentioned particles[16] have already illuminated somewhat, exhibits a relatively broad spectrum extending from the concrete to expanded and metaphorical uses. The basic verbal stem is intransitive, to which then the niphal, piel, and hiphil are added.[17] The concrete meaning emerges not in the qal but in the transitive (factitive) piel, especially in Isa. 28:25, which refers to the farmer "leveling, smoothing" (*šiwwâ,* "make even") the surface of a field, leading to an intransitive meaning in the qal, "be/become even, level." By contrast, the transitive piel in Ps. 131:2 attests an expanded use in that the object is now "my soul" *(napšî):* "but I have calmed *(šiwwîṯî)* and quieted *(dômamtî)* my soul,"[18] expanding the basic meaning "make even" psychologically to "(level), calm, make quiet." Since the form *šiwwîṯî* also appears in Isa. 38:13, though now without an object and hence usually altered to *šiwwa'tî,*[19] one might well consider whether the expression "my soul" has not been omitted here and the verb used elliptically.

Yet another situation arises in the parallel passages 2 S. 22:34 and Ps. 18:34(33), where use with the comparative particle *kᵉ,* "like," generates a metaphorical statement "make like, make the same as": "he made my feet like the feet of a deer *(mᵉšawweh . . . kᵉ),*" which in the qal would correspond to intransitive "be/become like, the same." As far as the relationship between "be/make the same" and "be/make level" is concerned, the spatially construed "be level" probably provided the point of departure, while the notion of "be the same" then represents an expanded and potentially metaphorical use." This expanded notion of "be/become like, make like" seems to have most strongly influenced OT usage.

The comparative usage associated with various particles[20] now dominates the qal. This context includes especially all the (earlier and later) passages in Proverbs, raising the question whether perhaps this usage, which exhibits a certain proximity to → משׁל *māšal* I, might not have developed precisely in wisdom circles or at least been quite popular there. Prov. 26:4 issues a warning of the wise: "Do not answer fools according to *(kᵉ)* their folly, or you will make yourself like them *(pen-tišweh-lô),*" a warning whose intention is to avoid the inappropriate or even fateful mistake of making oneself the same as a negatively characterized type of person. The sole niphal form also uses a conscious, descriptive comparison (Prov. 27:15) with regard to the "contentious wife," whom it compares negatively to the "continual dripping on a rainy day." This negative comparison does, however, have a positive didactic goal, namely, that the wife become less "contentious." In the latest part of Prov. 1–9, authors variously reflect on wisdom itself, comparing it in 3:15 and 8:11 with the (most precious) corals and "all jewels" (ZB) in emphasizing the superiority or even incomparability of wisdom.

The distance from here to the metaphorical usage in Deutero-Isaiah is thus not far. In Isa. 40:25 (qal) and 46:5 (hiphil), the question arises in a divine discourse regarding

---

16. See II.2.
17. See *HP,* 20-21.
18. Cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), in loc.; O. Loretz, "Zur Parallelität zwischen KTU 1.6 II 28-30 und Ps 131,2B," *UF* 17 (1985) 183-87.
19. See II.1 above.
20. See II.2.

who can compare to Yahweh. In 40:25 the question is brief: "To whom then will you compare me (*dmh* piel), or that I should be like him *(wᵉʾešweh),* says the Holy One."[21] In 46:5 it is more extensive: "To whom will you liken me (*dmh* piel) and make me equal *(wᵉṯašwû),* and compare me (*mšl* I hiphil), as though we were alike (*dmh* qal)?" Whereas Westermann translates *šwh* hiphil here as "make equal," Jenni correctly translates the hiphil causatively as "make to be equal, place equally, compare."[22] Lam. 2:13 raises a similar question regarding the appropriate comparison.

Yet another usage appears in the historically latest stratum, the three passages in Esther (3:8; 5:13; 7:4), which can be considered together semantically.[23] These passages focus on what is "appropriate" or (comparatively) suitable for the king (3:8; 7:4) or his dignitary Haman (5:13). This usage is not, by the way, necessarily far removed from that in Prov. 26:4 (or even 27:15). It might even be possible (albeit unlikely) to include here the difficult passage Job 33:27, rendering unnecessary such alterations as *šiwwâ* or *šillam,* "repay" (cf. *BHK*).[24]

2. *šwh II.* In its five piel occurrences, the presumed vb. *šāwâ* II deviates so considerably from the semantic variants of *šāwâ* already discussed that interpreters have not surprisingly postulated a special root for the relevant passages, two of which are in any case textually disputed (Ps. 119:30; Hos. 10:1; cf. *BHK; BHS*). With regard to the five piel forms, one can probably assume a measure of Aramaic influence, especially since the Tgs. later often replace Heb. *śîm/śûm,* "put, place," and *šîṯ,* "set up," by Aram. *šawwî.*

Be that as it may, the four passages from the Psalms (Ps. 16:8; 21:6[5]; 89:20[19]; 119:30) most closely approximate the meaning "put, place." Ps. 89:20(19) has a concrete object, the crown or diadem of the king, and uses the prep. *ʿal,* "on," whereas 21:6 uses the same preposition in a metaphorical sense by taking as its object the king's "splendor" and "majesty."[25] In 16:8 the object is God, the believer saying that "I put Yahweh before my eyes" (*šiwwîṯî yhwh lᵉnegdî;* NRSV "keep the Lord always before me"). When in 119:30 the believer then says "I set your ordinances before me," one is tempted, as in Isa. 38:13, to understand this statement as an ellipsis phraseologically related to that in Ps. 16:8. Finally, the prophetic statement in Hos. 10:1 portrays Israel metaphorically as a "luxuriant vine," though the exact translation of the passage is not clear. Nonetheless, H. W. Wolff rejects the usual translation "bring forth" on the basis of the metaphorical context and instead maintains *šwh* I piel in translating v. 1b "he yielded fruit accordingly."[26] In so doing, however, he further undermines the foundation of a possible vb. *šwh* II.

---

21. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 47.
22. Ibid., 182; *HP,* 11 (cf. 35).
23. See W. L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT* (Leiden, 1971), 364; cf., e.g., Lisowsky, 1415-16, for a different view.
24. So Even-Shoshan, 2089; cf. also *GesTh,* 1375; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 455.
25. So H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), in loc.
26. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 170-71.

3. *Aramaic.* In the Aramaic part of the OT, the use of *šwh* corresponds to that of Heb. *šwh* I,[27] though in Dnl. 5:21 the textual tradition does vacillate between peal *K*, *šᵉwî* (shewa/hateph seghol), "be/become equal, the same," and pael *Q, šawwîw,* "make equal," which is generally accepted.[28] By contrast the hithpael form in 3:29 expresses the passive, hence "be made equal (to)."

IV. Theological Considerations. As already seen, *šwh* I/II are generally used figuratively and in part metaphorically, often to express a comparison. Such usage often contextually involves theological aspects.

The most important theological use is the comparison of God in Deutero-Isaiah (40:25; 46:5), the background for which may be the comparisons found in wisdom literature. For if incomparability is attributed to wisdom (Prov. 3:15; 8:11),[29] then how much more so must it be attributed to the God of Israel, who intervenes and acts with more power than all the other gods. The interrogative form of such comparisons with Yahweh, presupposing the answer "no one," derives from a far broader, theologically significant linguistic field, one Labuschagne has thoroughly examined. Just as such comparisons can be applied to wisdom and to Yahweh, so also to the holy city Zion as it laments over its fall (Lam. 2:13).

Such comparisons can appear not only in admonitions of the wise (Prov. 26:4), however, but especially in the cultic language of believers as variously expressed in the Psalms (cf., e.g., Ps. 16:8; 18:34[33] par. 2 S. 22:34; Ps. 131:2; Isa. 38:13) and in connection with devotion to the law (cf. Ps. 119:30). Hence both general use[30] and use in theological contexts reveal the verb's relatively broad semantic spectrum.

V. 1. *Qumran.* This root rarely occurs in Qumran. The most easily comprehensible text is 1QH 15:23, which continues the OT comparisons praising Yahweh,[31] whereas CD 15:14 and especially 1Q27 1, II, 2,8 are more or less fragmentary.

2. *LXX.* The LXX translates the relatively few Hebrew occurrences by a whole series of Greek words (altogether 14). It even renders the parallel passages 2 S. 22:34 and Ps. 18:34(33) with different words. At the same time, however, no particular translation tendency is discernible.[32]

Sæbø

---

27. Here too *GesB,* 927, distinguishes two different roots.

28. Favoring *K,* e.g., ZB; cf. H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (1927; repr. Hildesheim, 1962), §47s. For *Q* cf. Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen,* §47r′; F. Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic. PLO* 5 (1961), 36 §83, 49 §132; also *KBL²*, 1129.

29. See III.1.

30. See III.

31. See Lohse, 166-67.

32. Cf. also W. Michaelis, "μιμέομαι κτλ.," *TDNT,* IV, 663-64 n. 7; idem, "ὁράω κτλ.," *TDNT,* V, 381; K. Weiss, "φέρω κτλ.," *TDNT,* IX, 73.

rael's neighbors.[17] According to 16:57, their contempt *(šāʾṭôṯ)* is grounded in Yahweh's own judgment over Jerusalem. By contrast, 28:24 and 26 promise that Yahweh will put a stop to Israel's neighbor's contempt for her when he calls them to account for their profound contempt *(biš'āṭ bᵉnepeš/biš'āṭ nepeš)* and their "joy (at Israel's plight)" *(bᵉśimḥaṯ kol-lēbāḇ,* 36:5; cf. 25:6).

4. *šôṭ šôṭēp.* The meaning of the noun *šôṭ* in Job 9:23 and Isa. 28:15,18 is disputed, with two translations being proposed.

a. The translation of the expression *šôṭ šôṭēp* in Isa. 28:15*(Q)*,18 as "streaming/flooding scourge" is advocated by, among others, H. Donner and H. Gese.[18] Gese especially has tried to support the meaning "scourge" for *šôṭ* in these passages by adducing the whip of the weather god Hadad, a mythologem attested in Assyrian iconography and literature. In the context of Isa. 28:14-22, this expression would then symbolize the Assyrian power against which Jerusalem thinks it can protect itself through a "covenant *(bᵉrîṯ)* with death" and an "agreement *(ḥōzeh/ḥāzûṯ)* with Sheol," possibly an allusion to the political alliance with Egypt.[19] According to the ensuing oracle of judgment (vv. 16ff.), however, Yahweh himself will thwart Jerusalem's arrogance (v. 18). "The heterogeneous character of this imagery in particular leaves an especially plastic impression and as such suggests that it came from the hand of the prophet."[20] B. Duhm had already tried to smooth out the expression by conjecturing (albeit with insufficient reason) *šôṭēṭ* instead of the ptcp. *šôṭēp,* then translating as "scourging scourge."[21]

b. The apparent tension between the noun and participle in this expression has led scholars since Barth to translate the noun *šôṭ,* with reference to Eth. *sōṭa,* "pour (out), empty," and Arab. *sauṭ,* "accumulation of water," as "flood," presupposing then a root **šwṭ* III for the Hebrew.[22] The translation of the expression in the LXX as *kataigís,* "hurricane," and in Pesh. as *šwwt' dgrwpy',* "massive flood," may also point in this direction.[23] In that case the image of the "raging flood" would clearly be related to the "covenant with death" and the "agreement with Sheol"; O. Kaiser points to the history of this theme in suggesting that the reference may then be to "the waters of death and the underworld" (cf. Job 38:16-17; Ps. 18:5-6[4-5]; 63:3,16[2,15]; 124:4).[24] Nonetheless, a genuinely reliable choice between the two hypotheses is not yet possible.[25]

The same applies to the noun *šôṭ* in Job 9:23. Those advocating the meaning "flood" include G. Fohrer, who adduces Ugar. *ṯ'ṭ* in arguing that deriving the noun from *šôṭ,*

---

17. → בזה *bāzâ (bāzāh),* II, 60-65, esp. 63; → קלל *qll.*

18. H. Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern. SVT* 11 (1964), 152; Gese, 128-30, 132-34; cf. also *HAL,* IV, 1441.

19. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39. CC* (Eng. trans. 2002), 38, 43.

20. Donner, *Israel unter den Völkern,* 152.

21. B. Duhm, *Jesaja. HKAT* III/1 (1902), 176.

22. *ZAW* 33 (1913) 306-7. Cf. *HAL,* IV, 1441.

23. See Wildberger, *Isaiah 28–39,* 30.

24. *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 251.

25. See also H. W. Hoffmann, *Die Intention der Verkündigung Jesajas. BZAW* 136 (1974), 24-25.

"whip," requires a text-critical alteration to *šôṭô*.[26] Fohrer then translates "when flood brings sudden death, he [God] mocks at the despair of the innocent,"[27] though this translation is by no means certain. The LXX paraphrases what it considers "an offensive text," while the Vg. renders *šôṭ* with the vb. *flagellare*, prompting F. Horst to maintain the MT and translate *šôṭ* as "scourge."[28]

III. 1. *Qumran.* In Qumran the vb. *šwṭ* I has hitherto been attested only in the qal (1QH 3:30,36; 1Q22 3, 9). The noun appears in the citation 4QpNah 2:3 and in 1QH 6:35 in the expression *m'byr šwṭ šwṭp*, whose background is probably Isa. 28:15,18, clearly suggesting the meaning "scourge" in this context.

2. *LXX.* The LXX generally translates the noun *šôṭ* as *mástix*, then in Josh. 23:13 as *hḗlos*, and figuratively in Isa. 10:26 as *plēgḗ*. It does not translate the verb consistently, rendering it rather with different verbs of motion, including *diérchesthai, periérchesthai, diaporeúein, periodeúein, peritréchein*. Commensurate with the context, it translates the qal participle and the noun *māšôṭ* in Ezk. 27:6,26,29 with *kōpēlátai sou* and the noun *miššôṭ* as *kṓpē*. It apparently understood the root *šwṭ* II correctly only in Ezk. 28:24,26, and 36:5, where it translates variously with a form of *atimázein*.[29]

Waschke

---

26. *WUS*, no. 2823; so also G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1952), 28.
27. *Hiob*, 196, 199.
28. Horst, *Hiob 1*, 138, 140-41.
29. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 43.

שׁוע *šw'*; שֶׁוַע *šewa'*; שׁוֹעַ *šôa'*; שׁוּעַ *šûa'*; שַׁוְעָה *šaw'â*

Contents: I. Occurrences and Meaning. II. 1. Psalms; 2. Job; 3. Other Passages. III. Qumran. IV. LXX.

I. Occurrences and Meaning. The root *šw'* is attested 21 times as a verb in the OT, but only in the piel. It does not appear in narrative texts. As a substantive the root appears as *šewa'* (Ps. 5:3[Eng. 2]), *šûa'* (Job 30:24; 36:19), *šaw'â* (Ex. 2:23; 1 S. 5:12; 2 S. 22:7; Ps. 18:7[6]; 34:16[15]; 39:13[12]; 40:2[1]; 102:2[1]; 145:19; Jer. 8:19; Lam. 3:56), and possibly as *šôa'* (Isa. 22:5). No difference in content is discernible in the use

deed hear even these young ones' cries for help, thus providing an answer to Job's complaint that God does not hear his cries.

3. *Other Passages.* In Hab. 1:2 the prophet presses Yahweh for having too long not heeded the prophet's cries. The forensic aspect appears again in the accusatory reference to the ongoing injustice. Lam. 3:8 also laments that Yahweh does not hear the cries for help. By contrast, v. 56 recalls that Yahweh did once heed the petitioner's voice amid the distress of adversaries and hopes that such past heeding will prompt Yahweh not to "close your ear to my cry for help" in the present situation. Here the form *l^ešaw'āṯî* has come into question. Considering the otherwise frequent references to *qôl* and *šm'* within the word field of *šw',* one need not view *l^ešaw'āṯî* as a gloss merely because of unusual line length or replace it with *lîšû'āṯî* parallel to *l^erawḥāṯî.*[8]

According to Ex. 2:23, the Israelites' cries for help under the oppression of slavery in Egypt rose up to God and were heard (vv. 24-25). "The climax 'groan–lament–cry for help' corresponds to the climax in God's own reactions in that he hears the groaning, remembers his covenant (with the fathers), looks upon the Israelites' plight, and makes himself known to them."[9] Jer. 8:19 also seems to issue a collective cry for help. Although *baṯ-'ammî* does constitute a grammatically singular subject, it probably refers to Jerusalem and its inhabitants and thus to the people as a whole.[10] The content of the lament is the experience of Yahweh's absence from Zion, an absence now presented with a query and an accusation.

The praise of Yahweh for having supplied aid in Jon. 2 recalls Ps. 31:23b(22b). Here the petitioner (given the lack of concrete information, it is probably not Jonah) speaks about how Yahweh answered his cry for help (Jon. 2:3[2]).

Two passages still do not quite accord with our findings thus far. Isa. 58:9 is peculiar in that *šw'* appears here in connection with an oracle of salvation assuring that Yahweh will answer the cries for help. According to 1 S. 5:12, the people of Ekron cry out because of the disaster that has befallen them as a result of the ark's presence in their city. Because non-Israelites are crying out for help here, the addressee is naturally not God or Yahweh, but rather the initially rather indistinct entity "heaven."

The use of *šôa'* in Isa. 22:5 in reference to an oracle of judgment on Jerusalem is problematical. According to O. Procksch, like *qôa'* in Ezk. 23:23 *šôa'* refers to a people.[11] In that case the similarly problematical *qîr* (Isa. 22:6) could conceivably, parallel to Elam, be a designation for a people. By contrast, O. Kaiser views *šôa'* as the verbal noun of *šw'* I, while H. Wildberger views it as a secondary masculine form of *šaw'ā* and *qr* as the cries of the attackers.[12] The continuation in vv. 12-13, however, pointing

8. For the former see H.-J. Kraus, *Threni. BK* XX (1956), 53. For the latter see D. R. Hillers, *Lamentations. AB* 7A (1972), 59-60, with LXX, Symmachus, and Pesh.

9. J. Scharbert, *Exodus. NEB* 24 (1989), 20.

10. See R. P. Carroll, *Jeremiah. OTL* (1986), 235-36.

11. *Jesaja I. KAT* IX (1930), 280.

12. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 137 n. e; Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. trans. 1997), 350-51.

שׁוּעָל šû'āl

Contents: I. Meaning and Etymology. II. The Fox in Israel's Surroundings. III. OT. IV. Early Versions.

I. Meaning and Etymology. The traditional translation of *šû'āl* is "fox" (*vulpes vulpes,* also *vulpes nilotica* and *vulpes flavescens*); indeed, the word still refers to this animal in Modern (Israeli) Hebrew (cf. Achituv). The OT and even later literature, however,[1] do not always distinguish clearly between "fox" and "jackal" *(canis aureus),* since the latter, although standing between foxes and wolves with respect to body build, for example, does nonetheless more strongly resemble foxes, making it more difficult to distinguish between them in the wild.[2] The jackal has a somewhat broader head, shorter ears, and a smaller nose and longer stride than the fox. The Palestinian fox resemble the "red fox" that lives in Europe and North America, though there are actually two kinds of foxes in Palestine,[3] a smaller variety in the south and a larger one in the north (Pinney). "Jackal" is also the translation of OT אִי* (Isa. 13:22; 34:14; Jer. 50:39)[4] and *tan* (Job 30:29; Ps. 44:20[Eng. 19]; Isa. 13:22; 34:13; 35:7; 43:20; Jer. 9:10[11]; 10:22; 14:6; 49:33; 51:37; Ezk. 29:3; Mic. 1:8; Mal. 1:3).[5] It differs from the fox, however, especially in its lifestyle, living in packs and often feeding on carrion, while foxes eat smaller vertebrates, insects, and fruits and never live in packs.

Like Hebrew, other Semitic languages sometimes fail to distinguish clearly between fox and jackal (and sometimes wolf; so in Egyptian[6]). As in the OT, where alongside *šû'āl* the form *š'lb* also appears, albeit only in a place name (Josh. 19:42; Jgs. 1:35; 1 K. 4:9),[7] Arabic also has two forms: *ṯa'lab* and *ṯu'āl.* The two forms are attested in Ugaritic personal names as well.[8] One also finds *šēlebu(m)* in Akkadian, *šuḫal* in

---

šû'āl. Y. Aḥituv, "שׁוּעָל," *EMiqr,* VII, 570-71; S. Bochartus, *Hierozoicon, sive Bipertitum opus de Animalibus S. Scripturae,* I (Lugduni Batavorum/Trajecti ad Rhenum, [3]1692), ex recensione Johannis Leusden, esp. 849-61; F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands* (2 vols.; Leiden, 1960), esp. 44, 100; G. Cansdale, *Animals of Bible Lands* (Exeter, 1970), esp. 124-26; J. Feliks, *The Animal World of the Bible* (Tel-Aviv, 1962), esp. 36-37; A. Jirku, *Materialien zur Volksreligion Israels* (Leipzig, 1914), esp. 111-16; P. Maiberger, "Fuchs," *NBL,* I, 711; O. Margalith, "Samson's Foxes," *VT* 35 (1985) 224-29; R. Pinney, *The Animals of the Bible* (Philadelphia, 1964), esp. 120-21; W. Richter, "Fuchs," *KlPauly,* II, 623-24.

1. E.g., *AuS,* IV (1935), 305; VI (1939), 341.
2. See also the precise illustrations in *Fauna and Flora of the Bible* (London, [2]1980), 31.
3. Or even three according to Feliks, 37.
4. See *GesB*[18], 44.
5. See *HAL,* IV, 1445; a different view in Margalith, 227-28.
6. See W. Helck, *WbMyth,* I, 324; cf. in this regard G. F. Moore, *Judges. ICC* 7 (1895), 341; Margalith, 226.
7. See W. Borée, *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas* (Hildesheim, [2]1968), 34.
8. *UT,* nos. 2717-18; *WUS,* nos. 2910-11; *PNU,* 198.

Amorite, and *taʿlā* in Aramaic (spelled *šʿl* in the Sefire tablets) and Syriac.[9] There is probably no relationship with Eth. *takʷlā*, "wolf, jackal."[10]

The derivation from *šʿl* is etymologically extremely uncertain. Because of the way foxes "yap," Bochartus even thought the basic meaning may be "cough."[11] Gesenius thought the meaning may be "split, slit open, dig out," adducing the derived nouns *šōʿal*, "cupped hand" (1 K. 20:10; Isa. 40:12; Ezk. 13:19) and *mišʿôl*, "narrow path, passage" (Nu. 22:24).[12] He also suspected a connection with roots such as *šʿr*, *šḥr*, and *šgr*. F. Hitzig thus interpreted *šûʿāl* as "cave animal, fox."[13] Although some lexicons even advocate a distinction between *šʿl* I and II, others no longer present an etymology.[14]

II. The Fox in Israel's Surroundings. Historically the fox plays a role in many different cultures and religions of the world, from Shinto to the Low German Reinke de Vos.[15] In literature the slyness of the fox has become proverbial, for example, in the Babylonian fairy tale of the fox or in classical literature.[16] The fox emerges as a clever animal as early as the Sumerian myth of Enki and Ninḫursag.[17] Indeed, it occupies preeminent status among the animals of Greek fables.[18] It is also mentioned as capable of destroying vineyards (Theocritus 5.112-13). In Rome the fox acquired cultic significance at the festival of Cerealia (April 19), where foxes were turned loose in the grain fields with torches on their tails.[19] In ancient Egyptian love poetry, the "young fox" refers metaphorically to the woman's lover.[20]

III. OT. The term *šûʿāl* appears in the OT in Jgs. 15:4; Neh. 3:35 (4:3); Ps. 63:11(10); Cant. 2:15; Lam. 5:18; Ezk. 13:4. The PN *šûʿāl* also appears in 1 Ch. 7:36 as

---

9. On Akkadian see *AHw*, III, 1210; cf. A. Salonen, *Jagd und Jagdtiere im alten Mesopotamien* (Helsinki, 1976), 262-63; on Amorite, *APNM*, 267; on Sefire, *KAI* 222A.33; *DNSI*, II, 1179; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire. BietOr* 19 (1967), 50; on Syriac, *LexSyr*, 830.

10. W. Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Geʿez (Classical Ethiopic)* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 573; cf. similarly T. Nöldeke, *ZDMG* 30 (1876) 769 n. 3; M. Bittner, *WZKM* 23 (1909) 411.

11. Bochartus, 850.

12. *GesTh*, 1457.

13. *Der Prophet Jesaja* (Heidelberg, 1833), 52.

14. Among the former: *GesB*, 853; *BDB*, 1043; among the latter: *KBL*², 956; *LexHebAram*, 829-30; *HAL*, IV, 1445, calls it a "primary noun."

15. Cf. A. Bertholet, *Wörterbuch der Religionen* (Stuttgart, 1952), 153; H. Schmökel, *Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orient* (Stuttgart, 1961), 227.

16. For the former see *BWL*, 186-209; cf. also the proverb of the lion and fox, ibid., 281. For the latter see Richter, 623.

17. Cf. D. O. Edzard, *WbMyth*, I, 58; also B. Alster, "On the Earliest Sumerian Literary Tradition," *JCS* 28 (1976) 125 n. 52; *ANET*, 37-41, esp. 41, ll. 220ff.

18. Richter, 624.

19. Ovid, *Fasti* 4.679-712. See W. Eisenhut, *KlPauly*, I, 1115; cf. also J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, V/1 (New York, ³1951), 296-97, who viewed these animals as representatives of the grain spirits.

20. See O. Keel, *Song of Songs. CC* (Eng. trans. 1994), 110.

well as in Hebrew inscriptions.[21] The term *šûʿāl* also appears in geographical names: *ʾereṣ šûʿāl* in 1 S. 13:17 (in Benjamin, near Ophrah;[22] cf. *ʾereṣ šaʿᵃlîm,* 1 S. 9:4[23]) and *ḥᵃṣar šûʿāl* in Josh. 15:28; 19:3; 1 Ch. 4:28; Neh. 11:27 (near Beer-sheba).[24]

Jirku believes that in almost every OT passage the fox represents an omen of bad luck since all these passages involve events of human misfortune; thus it is inappropriate to ask whether the reference in these passages is to jackals rather than to foxes. One is probably better advised, however, not to restrict the meaning of the word *šûʿāl* prejudicially in the OT in this way, not least because in the wild the fox and the jackal are so difficult to distinguish.[25]

Jgs. 15:4 may well refer to jackals[26] in the story of how Samson caught three hundred of these animals, "took some torches . . . turned the jackals tail to tail, and put a torch between each pair of tails," then turned the terrified animals loose upon the standing grain of the Philistines (G. F. Moore and C. F. Burney consider it impermissible to remove the element of the miraculous from Samson's trick by replacing "fox" with "jackal"[27]). This event recalls the Roman Cerealia, which is often adduced in discussions of this passage.[28] Margalith, however, emphasizes that this narrative is not to be viewed as an historical account and as a local version of the widespread "fox motif"; its life setting is rather to be found in a local etiological narrative. According to him, the Philistines had given the jackal (the animal that also gave the city of Shaalbim its name[29]) the Greek nickname *lámpouris,* "torchtail"; the Israelites, failing to understand such a name for the gray jackal, invented an etiological story associated with their hero Samson to explain the name.

Ezk. 13:4, which is often viewed as an addendum or gloss, compares Israel's prophets to foxes among the ruins. Various answers are given to the question just why prophets are compared to foxes. J. Herrmann suggests that the allusion is to the undermining of the wall remnants.[30] H. Gressmann points out how "they exploited their poor victims."[31] G. Fohrer mentions their association with impending disaster (concurring with Jirku's view above).[32] W. Zimmerli adduces Neh. 3:35, which is possibly using an idi-

---

21. Cf., e.g., D. Diringer, *Le Iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi* (Florence, 1934), 200; F. Vattioni, "I sigilli ebraici," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 364; P. Bordreuil, "Nouveaux Sceaux Hébreux, Araméens et Ammonites," *Sem* 26 (1976) 51-52 (no. 17); on the Arad inscriptions cf. A. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébraïques, I. Les ostraca. LAPO* 9 (1977), 205, 209; also D. Pardee, "Letters from Tel Arad," *UF* 10 (1978) 335-36.

22. *LexHebAram,* 830.

23. *GTTOT,* §676.

24. F. M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine,* II (Paris, ³1967), 344; *GTTOT,* §317, no. 21; cf. N. Avigad, "Two Hebrew Inscriptions on Wine Jars," *IEJ* 22 (1972) 6-7.

25. See I above.

26. So, among others, K. Galling, *BRL²*, 150.

27. Moore, *Judges,* 341; C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges* (London, ²1920), 368.

28. E.g., Burney, *Judges,* 393-95. See II above.

29. See I above.

30. *Ezechiel. KAT* XI (1924), 84.

31. *Der Messias. FRLANT* 43 (1929), 79.

32. *Ezechiel. HAT* I/13 (²1955), 69 n. 1.

omatic reference to the way foxes "jump up on to the walls (of a vineyard) and break them down."[33]

Adversaries who threaten the psalmist's life will be "given over to the power of the sword" and will be "prey for jackals" (Ps. 63:11[10]). Here the reference can hardly be to foxes, since as a rule they do not eat carrion.[34] By contrast, the metaphor in Cant. 2:15 considers foxes fully capable of decimating the "vineyards . . . in blossom."[35] The vineyard may be a metaphor for the girl's cultured behavior or for her charms, while the "foxes," although small, are those who pose a potential threat to those charms.[36]

Lam. 5:18 describes how foxes (or possibly jackals) roam about on desolate Mt. Zion (cf. also Mic. 3:12 [cited in Jer. 26:18]; also Jer. 9:10[11]; 10:22 [*tan*]),[37] imagery suggesting total devastation.

In Neh. 3:35(4:3) the Ammonite Tobiah, albeit in mellifluous speech, scoffs at the Judeans' efforts to rebuild the Jerusalem wall with words that are at once both threatening and mocking: "that stone wall they are building — any fox going up on it would break it down"; i.e., the wall can easily be torn down.[38] Here too one might replace "fox" with "jackal," especially if one maintains that foxes cannot jump well.[39]

IV. Early Versions. The LXX always renders *šû'āl* as *alṓpēx* (cf. also Mt. 8:20; Lk. 9:58; 13:32). The same word appears in Jgs. 1:35 within a free paraphrasing of the place name Shaalbim and in 1 K. 21(20):10 as a questionable rendering of *šeʿālîm,* a word generally translated as "cupped hand, handful."[40] The Vg. always translates as *vulpes.*

The word is not yet attested in the Qumran writings.

Mulder†

---

33. *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 293.

34. See I above; cf. H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 268.

35. See II above. Keel, *Song,* 110; cf. H.-P. Müller, *Vergleich und Metapher im Hohenlied. OBO* 56 (1984), 47.

36. So, among others, W. Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth; Das Hohelied; Die Klagelieder. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 134-35; F. Landy, *Paradoxes of Paradise. Bible and Literature Series* 7 (Sheffield, 1983), 240-41; Keel, *Song,* 110: "great lover or womanizer."

37. See W. Rudolph, *KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 262.

38. See A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Nehemia. KAT* XIX/2 (1987), 79.

39. See Jirku, 113.

40. See I above; on the latter text see already J. F. Schleusner, *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus,* I (Leipzig, 1820), 173.

(2 S. 2:28; 18:16; 20:22), announce victory (1 S. 13:3), or to fulfill an otherwise unidentified function (Job 39:24-25; Jer. 42:14; Am. 2:2). The account of the conquest of Jericho occupies special status in that here the sounding of horns clearly exhibits cultic features (Josh. 6:4,6,8,9,13,16,20).

2. *Cult.* The sounding of horns also announces the accession of a new king (2 S. 15:10, Absalom; 1 K. 1:34,39,41, Solomon; 2 K. 9:13, Jehu). Although Yahweh's epiphany at Sinai is also accompanied by the sounding of horns (Ex. 19:16,19; 20:18), this account probably reflects a later cultic celebration. The sounding of the *šôpār* does, however, appear in various other purely cultic contexts. The commencement of the Year of Jubilee is announced by the sounding of horns (*šôpār tᵉrû'â,*[5] Lev. 25:9). According to Ps. 81:4(3), the day of the new moon is similarly celebrated with the sounding of the *šôpār,* and the same verse mentions the day of the full moon *(kēseh)* and "our festal day" *(ḥag).* Several expressions for shouts of joy, singing, and music appear in the context as well.

The sounding of horns announces a general fast (Joel 2:15; perhaps Isa. 58:1). When David brings the ark up to Jerusalem, he does so amid the sounding of horns and shouts of joy (*tᵉrû'â,* 2 S. 6:15). The parallel account in 1 Ch. 15:28 mentions other musical instruments as well. Ps. 47:6(5) probably also refers to a procession with the ark: "God has gone up *('ālâ)* with a shout *(tᵉrû'â),* Yahweh with the sound of a horn [NRSV 'trumpet'; *qôl šôpār*]." Since vv. 7-9(6-8) refer to Yahweh as king, this rejoicing is that which is appropriate for a king. The same applies to the royal psalm of Yahweh, Ps. 98, where v. 6 encourages the people "with trumpets *(ḥᵃṣōṣᵉrôṯ)* and the sound of the horn make[s] a joyful noise (*rw'* hiphil) before the king, Yahweh." Ps. 150:3 mentions the *šôpār* along with other instruments as part of the musical accompaniment of praise. According to 2 Ch. 15:14, the music of horns and trumpets accompanies an oath ceremony.

The "sounding of the horn" of the day of Yahweh combines motifs from the announcements of war with those of epiphanies[6] (so Joel 2:1; Zeph. 1:16; cf. also Isa. 18:3; 27:13; Zech. 9:14).

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX translates *šôpār* largely as *sálpinx* (38 times + *sálpinx keratínē,* Ps. 98:6) or as *keratínē* (21 times). In Josh. 6:7(8) it translates *baššôpār* as *eutónōs,* and transcribes it in 1 Ch. 15:28 as *sōpher.*

2. *Qumran.* The term *šôpār* occurs 6 times in the War Scroll, always in connection with signaling during battle (1QM 7:14; 8:9,11,15; 16:7-8; 17:13 par. 4QMᵃ 11, II, 22). One additional, albeit uncertain occurrence is 11QMelch 2:25, which mentions the sounding of the signal horn throughout the land on the Day of Atonement (cf. Lev. 25:9).

Ringgren

---

5. → רוע *rw',* XIII, 412-15.
6. Cf. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 232, on Isa. 27:13.

שׁוּר šûr

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. *šûr* I: 1. Use; 2. LXX. III. *šûr* II: 1. Use; 2. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* There are at least two roots *šwr;* von Soden associates *šûr* I with Akk. *šurru,* "bend down, bow, lean forward"; a relationship with Ugar. *ḏrt,* "dream, vision," is also possible.[1] Scholars generally associate *šûr* II with Arab. *sāra,* "travel, journey" (cf. *sayyārah,* "caravan"), and Palmyr. *syrt',* "caravan" (cf. Middle Heb. *šᵉyārâ*).[2] It is uncertain whether Jewish Aram. *šᵉwar,* "jump, hop," is also related. Some exegetes think this situation represents two different developments of the same root and that the hapax legomenon *tᵉšûrâ* in 1 S. 9:7 likely derives from *šwr* I.[3]

2. *Occurrences.* According to *HAL,* there are 11 reliable occurrences of *šûr* I, including 9 in Job.[4] The term *šûr* II is attested only 3 times. The root *šûr* has not yet been attested in Qumran.

II. *šûr I.*

1. *Use.* The form *šûr* I often parallels verbs for "see," a situation helping to secure the meaning. It also applies to the two occurrences in the oracles of Balaam, Nu. 23:9, "For from the top of the crags I see *(rā'â)* it (the people of Israel), from the hills I behold *(šûr)* it"; and 24:17, "I see *(rā'â)* him, but not now; I behold him *(šûr),* but not near." The latter passage probably refers to a vision of the coming ruler.

šûr. W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," *Studies in OT Prophecy. FS T. H. Robinson* (New York, 1950), 1-18, esp. 7; A. Bertholet, "Zur Stelle Hohes Lied 4:8," *Abhandlungen zur semitischen Religionskunde und Sprachwissenschaft. FS W. W. Graf Baudissin. BZAW* 33 (1918), 47-53; J. Boehmer, "Welchen Sinn hat Hohes Lied 4,8?" *MGWJ* 80 (1936) 449-53; J. Day, *Molech: A God of Human Sacrifice in the OT. UCOP* 41 (1989), esp. 50-52; G. R. Driver, "Difficult Words in the Hebrew Prophets," *FS T. H. Robinson,* 52-72, esp. 58-59; idem, "Studies in the Vocabulary of the OT VII," *JTS* 35 (1934) 380-93, esp. 389; C. G. Howie, *The Date and Composition of Ezekiel. JBLMS* 4 (1950), esp. 60-61; A. Vaccari, "Note critiche ed esegetiche," *Bibl* 28 (1947) 394-406, esp. 398-99; P. Wernberg-Møller, "Two Notes," *VT* 8 (1958) 305-8, esp. 307ff.

1. See *AHw,* III, 1285; *WUS,* no. 2722.
2. See A. Guillaume, "Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography: A Comparative Study II," *AbrN* 2 (1960/61) 33; *DNSI,* II, 1130.
3. *HAL,* IV, 1449-50, 1802; cf. S. M. Paul, "1 Samuel 9,7: An Interview Fee," *Bibl* 59 (1978) 542-44; P. Xella, "Fenicio *mšr* (Tabnit, 5) ed ebraico *tšwrh* (1 Samuele 9:7)," *UF* 14 (1982) 298-302; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography XI," *Bibl* 54 (1973) 354, believes it derives from *šwr* II.
4. *HAL,* IV, 1450.

eplḗthynas tḗn porneían sou met' autṓn. There can be little doubt that the LXX translators were not familiar with the vb. *šûr* II.

Kapelrud†

שׁוֹר *šôr*

Contents: I. 1. Occurrences; 2. Meaning; 3. LXX; 4. Qumran. II. Secular Usage: 1. General Considerations; 2. As an Animal for Work and Slaughter. III. Legal Texts: 1. Laws; 2. Commandments; 3. Wisdom. IV. Figurative Usage: 1. Metaphors; 2. Comparisons; 3. Poetic Considerations. V. Religious Usage: 1. Imprecations and Oracles; 2. Sacrifices; 3. Imagery and Cult in the Ancient Near East and Israel.

I. 1. *Occurrences.* The term *šôr* is a primary noun.[1] Alongside Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic, it is also attested in Old Aramaic *(šrh),* Middle Hebrew *(šôr),* Jewish Aramaic *(tôr),* Akkadian *(šūru[m]),* Ugaritic *(ṯr),* Old South Arabic *(ṯwr),* Ethiopic *(šôr),* Tigre *(sôr),* Tigriña *(sôr),* and Arabic *(ṯaur).* It is consistently attested as a biconsonantal, monosyllabic word whose second consonant is *r* and whose first is generally a sibilant varying among *s, š, ṯ,* and *t.* The presence of this word in Greek *(taúros),* Latin

---

šôr. M. Auerbach and L. Smolar, "Aaron, Jeroboam, and the Golden Calves," *JBL* 86 (1967) 129-40; A. Alt, "The God of the Fathers," *Essays on OT History and Religion* (Eng. trans., Oxford, 1966), 1-77; L. R. Bailey, "The Golden Calf," *HUCA* 42 (1971) 97-115; F. S. Bodenheimer, *The Animals of Palestine* (Jerusalem, 1935); J. P. Brown, "The Sacrificial Cult and Its Critique in Greek and Hebrew I," *JSS* 24 (1979) 159-73; G. Dalman, *AuS,* VI (1939), esp. 160-79; J. Debus, *Die Sünde Jerobeams. FRLANT* 93 (1967); O. Eissfeldt, "Lade und Stierbild," *ZAW* 58 (1940/41) 190-215 = *KlSchr,* II (1963) 282-305; Y. Feliks, *The Animal World of the Bible* (Tel Aviv, 1962); idem, "*lô'* = *šôr,*" *Leš* 44 (1979/80) 130-36; K. Galling, "Viehwirtschaft," *BRL*², 351-55, esp. 351; J. Hahn, *Das "Goldene Kalb." Die Jahwe-Verehrung bei Stierbildern in der Geschichte Israels. EH* XXIII/154 (²1987); M.-L. Henry, *Das Tier im religiösen Bewusstsein des alttestamentlichen Menschen. SGV* 220/221 (1958); I. Lewy, "The Story of the Golden Calf Reanalysed," *VT* 9 (1959) 318-22; S. E. Loewenstamm, "The Making and Destruction of the Golden Calf," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 481-90 = *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literatures. AOAT* 204 (1980), 236-45; L. Malten, "Der Stier im Kult und mythischem Bild," *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Berlin* 43 (1928), 90-139; H. Motzki, "Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Stierkultes in der Religionsgeschichte Israels," *VT* 25 (1975) 470-85; E. Nielsen, "Ass and Ox in the OT," *Studia orientalia. FS J. Pedersen* (Copenhagen, 1953), 263-74; E. Otto, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Stierkulte in Ägypten* (Leipzig, 1938); W. Pangritz, *Das Tier in der Bibel* (Munich, 1963); R. Péter-Contesse, "פר et שור. Note de lexicographie hébraïque," *VT* 25 (1975) 486-96; idem, "Note on the Semantic Domains of Two Hebrew Words: פר and שור," *BT* 27 (1976) 119-21; R. Pinney, *The Animals of the Bible* (Philadelphia, 1964); S. Schoer, *In Israel gab es Bilder. OBO* 74 (1987), esp. 81-104; J. A. Soggin, "Der offiziell geförderte Synkretismus in Israel während des 10. Jahrhunderts," *ZAW* 78 (1966) 179-204; M. Weippert, "Gott und Stier," *ZDPV* 77 (1961) 93-117.

1. *HAL,* IV, 1451.

similarly the precise regulations for dealing with the firstborn of oxen in Ex. 22:29(30); 34:19; Lev. 27:26; Nu. 18:17; Dt. 15:19. Because the firstborn belong to Yahweh and are holy to him, they are not to work and may not be redeemed. Because the Sabbath rest also applies to the ox (Ex. 23:12; Dt. 5:14), it is evaluated as a part of creation just as are human beings.[17] The extension of the ban (devotion to destruction) to oxen (Josh. 6:21; 7:24; 1 S. 15:3; 22:19) means that all that lives is to be destroyed. Dietary laws concerning the consumption of clean animals naturally also deal with oxen (Dt. 14:4), whose fat, however, may not be eaten (Lev. 7:23).

3. *Wisdom.* Wisdom sayings also deal with oxen. Prov. 14:4 considers that although one has a clean crib without oxen, their strength yields abundant crops. Prov. 15:17 contrasts a sparse dinner of vegetables with love and an opulent meal of a fatted ox with hatred, maintaining, of course, that the former is preferable to the latter. Finally, Job complains that the wicked are lucky in that their bull breeds without fail and thus increases their wealth (Job 21:10).

IV. Figurative Usage.

1. *Metaphors.* Job apparently alludes to a wisdom saying[18] when he defends his own lament by pointing out how the ox does not low if it has fodder (Job 6:5). Such statements touch on the figurative use of this word.[19] Isa. 1:3 adduces the natural and instinctive relationship between the ox and its owner in pointing out how absurd it is that Israel separates itself from Yahweh. It is difficult to determine whether, as O. Kaiser suggests, the reference is to the loyalty of animals toward their owners, or, as Henry suggests, the author is pointing out how the divine order is in fact lived and maintained.[20]

2. *Comparisons.* In an extensive comparison with a young man who follows after a harlot, the ox is described as an animal that "goes to the slaughter" (Prov. 7:22), i.e., to its death. In the story of Balaam, Israel is compared to an ox that "licks up the grass of the field" (Nu. 22:4). Oxen that eat grass are a recurring *tertium comparationis* in Dnl. 4:22,29-30(25,32-33); 5:21 (pl. only in these passages).

3. *Poetic Considerations.* The "face of an ox" represents one of the four faces of the throne chariot (Ezk. 1:10). Dt. 33:17 refers to the "firstborn bull" of Joseph that is full of majesty.

Ugaritic literature additionally provides the following express comparisons. Ba'al falls to the ground like a bull *(km ṯr)* and sinks down like a wild ox *(km ibr);*[21] these

---

17. Noth, *Exodus,* 190, "because they are an integral part of the creation which from time to time is to return to its 'rest'"; a different view is taken by Henry, 12.

18. See Fohrer, *Hiob,* 169.

19. See A. Wunsche, *Die Bildersprache des AT* (Leipzig, 1906), 43-47.

20. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. ^{2}1983), 11; Henry, 44-45.

21. *KTU* 1.12, II, 54-55.

"desires a cow-calf in Dubr, a heifer in Shihlmemat-field."[35] This imagery doubtless plays on the customary association of Baʿal with fertility; the only question is whether one can view these passages as the religio-historical analogy to the "golden calf," as Soggin emphatically does.[36] Militating against this view is that Ugaritic texts attest the expression *ṯr il* a total of 16 times, and that thus El — and only El — bears the title *ṯr,* "bull," and that the title *ṯr* occurs another 11 times absolutely while nonetheless still always referring to El.[37] In Ugarit, then, El is the "divine bull";[38] because El is the lord of the divine pantheon and the father of human beings and as such the point or orientation for the entirety of gods and human beings, there can be no question that the title *ṯr* here refers not to the idea of fertility but to that of power, strength, and preeminence.

These considerations probably answer the additional question regarding which of the two deities, El or Baʿal, represents the testator for the "bull-like" features in the understanding of Yahweh; the answer is El,[39] a view also supported by the broad OT identification of El and Yahweh in contrast to its largely consistent rejection of Baʿal. Hence the "golden image of the bull" is to be understood as an expression of the power and majesty of Yahweh, the preeminent king, Yahweh of hosts.

Zobel†

---

35. *KTU* 1.10, II, 28; 1.5, V, 18ff.; *ANET,* 139a.
36. Soggin, 201-2.
37. Documentation in *WUS,* no. 2932.
38. Ibid.
39. So also H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), 319-20; cf. Weippert, 102-3.

שׁוּשַׁן *šûšan*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT Use: 1. General Considerations; 2. Occurrences and Meaning. III. LXX and Qumran.

šûšan. G. Dalman, "Die Lilie der Bibel," *PJ* 21 (1925) 90-100; H. Engel, *Die Susanna-Erzählung. OBO* 61 (1985), esp. 74-75, 92-93; J. Feliks, "Lilie," *BHHW,* II, 1093; H. Frehen, "Lilie," *BL*², 1057; Z. Goldmann, "Das Symbol der Lilie. Ursprung und Bedeutung," *AKG* 57 (1975) 247-99, pls. I-XVI; O. Keel, *Deine Blicke sind Tauben. Zur Metaphorik des Hohen Liedes. SBS* 114/115 (1984), esp. 63-78.

I. Etymology. The Hebrew term *š(w)šn* is an Egyptian loanword, *sšn,* "lotus";[1] Middle Heb. *šôšān/šôšan, šôšannâ,* "goblet-shaped blossom, flower, rose, lily";[2] Syr. *šawšantā',* "lily";[3] Arab. *sausan,* "iris."[4]

II. OT Use.

1. *General Considerations.* The lexeme *š(w)šn* occurs 17 times in the OT, including 4 times in the narrative writings (where it refers to ornaments), 8 in Canticles, 4 in Psalm superscriptions, and 1 in the prophets. Forms include *šûšan* (1 K. 7:19; Ps. 60:1[Eng. S]), *šôšān* (1 K. 7:22,26), *šôšannâ* (2 Ch. 4:5; Cant. 2:1,2; Hos. 14:6[7]), and *šō/ôšannîm* (Ps. 45:1[S]; 69:1[S]; 80:1[S]; Cant. 2:16; 4:5; 5:13; 6:2,3; 7:3[2]).

D. Michel notes that the singular form ending in *-â* in Cant. 2:1,2; Hos. 14:6(5) refers to the individual plant, the plural form to a group of plants, and the singular form without an ending in 1 K. 7:19,22,26 to the plant genus, though he must concede that the singular form without an ending in 1 K. 7:26 has a corresponding feminine form ending in *-â* in 2 Ch. 4:5.[5]

2. *Occurrences and Meaning.* Because *š(w)šn* is an Egyptian loanword, one can probably assume that in the OT as well it generally refers to the lotus or water lily,[6] and not, as is usually assumed, to the lily.

According to 1 K. 7:19a and 22a, the two pillars in front of the temple were topped with "lotus-work" *(ma'ᵃśēh šûšan/šôšān),* though the details are extremely unclear.[7] The edge of the molten sea is described as being "like the brim of a cup, like the flower of a lotus blossom *(peraḥ šôšān/šôšannâ)*" (1 K. 7:26; 2 Ch. 4:5), i.e., the brim was probably shaped like an opening lotus blossom.[8]

The term *š(w)šn* occurs most frequently in Canticles. The song in 2:1-3 commences with the woman speaking about herself: "I am the *ḥᵃḇaṣṣeleṯ* of Sharon and the *šôšannaṯ* of the valleys" (v. 1), to which the man responds: "As a *šôšannâ* among brambles, so is my love among maidens" (v. 2). Here the woman consciously compares herself to the lotus flower, the primary symbol of the Egyptian idea of regeneration,[9] and is identified with it by her lover.

Cant. 7:3b(2b) says of the woman: "your belly is a heap of wheat, encircled with *šôšannîm,*" a metaphor referring less to the form of the woman's stomach than to the fertility (of the womb) and potential nourishment (provided by the wheat). "In Egypt it was a carefully maintained custom to decorate foodstuffs of all kinds with lotus flow-

1. *WbÄS,* III, 485-86; cf. M. Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the OT* (London, 1962), 159.
2. Jastrow, 1543; *ANH,* 418.
3. *LexSyr,* 767.
4. Wehr, 441; Lane, I/4, 1466.
5. Michel, 64-65.
6. So the emphatic view of O. Keel, *Song of Songs. CC* (Eng. trans. 1994), 78-80.
7. Cf. E. Würthwein, *Das erste Buch der Könige 1–16. ATD* 11/1 (²1985), 74-75; M. Görg, "Zur Dekoration der Tempelsäulen," *BN* 13 (1980) 17-20.
8. M. Noth, *Könige 1–16. BK* IX/1 (²1983), 155.
9. Keel, *Song,* 80.

ers"; such flowers "illustrate the freshness and regenerative power of the . . . foods."[10] With the next sentence, "Your two breasts are like two fawns, twins of a gazelle *(ṣᵉḇîyâ)*" (v. 4[3]), a metaphor Keel refers not only to the shape and softness of the woman's breasts but just as much to their vivifying power;[11] because inhabitants of the steppes and mountains survived like gazelles in the harsh wilderness, such gazelles could become "symbols of life and of a renewal of life" and are frequently found on Egyptian seal amulets. Keel thus thinks it appropriate that Cant. 4:5 attests the expanded statement, "Your two breasts are like two fawns, twins of a gazelle *(ṣᵉḇîyâ),* that feed among the *šôšannîm,*" since Egyptian illustrations often depict the lotus flower alongside the gazelle.[12] Because in reality the gazelle does not graze among lotus flowers, this passage represents a symbolic association.[13]

The same applies to the song in Cant. 6:1-3. To the question regarding where her beloved has gone (v. 1), the woman answers that he has "gone down to his garden . . . to pasture in the gardens *(r'h),* and to gather *šôšannîm*" (v. 2b). She concludes by saying, "I am my beloved's and my beloved is mine; he pastures *(r'h)* among the *šôšannîm*" (v. 3). The woman refers to herself as the garden and according to Keel describes her beloved as a gazelle, as suggested by a comparison of the wording of v. 3b and 4:5b.[14] The latter verse occurs in a slightly altered form in 2:16: "My beloved is mine, and I am his; he pastures *(r'h)* among the *šôšannîm.*" Here too Keel believes the beloved is being described as a gazelle.[15]

One should note, however, that 6:2-3 and 2:16 deviate from the general metaphorical use of gazelles in Canticles. The gazelle appears 7 times in Canticles.[16] The statement "I adjure you *biṣḇā'ôṯ*" (2:7; 3:5) can be ignored, as can the comparison of the female breasts with "twins of a *ṣᵉḇîyâ*" (4:5; 7:4[3]; see above). Three passages use *ṣᵉḇî* in connection with the beloved: "my beloved, be like *(dᵉmēh-lᵉḵā)* a gazelle" (2:17; similarly 8:14); "my beloved is like *(dômeh)* a gazelle" (2:9). Here the reference is to the swiftness of the beloved,[17] something the vb. *r'h* (6:2-3; 2:16) virtually contradicts.

In 5:13b the woman says of the beloved that "his lips are *šôšannîm,* distilling liquid myrrh." This reference need not be to lotus flowers and to the "vivifying effect of kisses."[18] The traditional interpretation as red flowers seems appropriate,[19] particularly since Keel's reference to Prov. 24:26 ("one who gives an honest answer gives a kiss on the lips") and to ills. 62-66 of his own comm. (where the focus is indeed on lotus flowers, but not on kisses) in no way supports his interpretation.[20]

---

10. Ibid., 235, 234.
11. Ibid., 150.
12. Ibid., 147, 150.
13. Ibid., 151.
14. Ibid., 210.
15. Ibid., 114.
16. → צְבִי *ṣᵉḇî,* XII, 235-36.
17. Cf. Keel, *Song,* 96.
18. Ibid., 201.
19. E.g., Dalman, 90; Engel, 92.
20. Keel, *Song,* 201.

The description of salvation in Hos. 14:6-8(5-7) contains numerous parallels with the language of Canticles.[21] Here Yahweh says, "I will be like the dew to Israel; he shall blossom like the *šôšannâ*" (v. 6a[5a]). The text does not indicate whether *šôšannâ* refers to the lotus or to the "luxuriant beauty of the lily," or is a more "comprehensive genus term" that includes irises and tulips.[22]

The meaning of *šō/ôšannîm* and *šûšān* is completely obscure in Ps. 45:1(S); 60:1(S); 69:1(S); 80:1(S).[23] Hence scholars generally suspect that the text should be emended to *šûšāniṯ* as a reference to Susian (Shushite) musical instruments, that the expression refers to the use of certain kinds of flowers in cultic and sacrificial contexts, or finally that the reference is to a six-stringed zither (after Assyr. *šuššu*).[24]

III. LXX and Qumran. The LXX translates *š(w)šn* as *krínon* except in the Psalm superscriptions, where it uses the plural passive participle of *alloioún*, "alter, change," which probably derives from a misunderstanding.

The only Qumran occurrence (1QH 10:31, reconstructed), similar to Hos. 14:6(5) (see above), refers to personal welfare (in both passages with the vb. *pāraḥ*).

Schmoldt

---

21. See H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 234.

22. For the former see J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* 24/1 (1983), 173; for the latter, W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 248; Wolff, *Hosea*, 236, citing *AuS*, I/2 (1928), 360.

23. → עוד *'wd*, X, 513 (IV.1.c)

24. For the first see H. Gunkel, *Intro. to Psalms* (Eng. trans., Macon, Ga., 1998), 351: "according to the Shushites"; for the second, S. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien*, IV (1922; Oslo, ²1961), 29-30; idem, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (2 vols.; Eng. trans., repr. Nashville, 1967), II, 214; for the third, O. Glaser, "Die ältesten Psalmenmelodien," *Zeitschrift für Semitisik* 8 (Amsterdam, 1932) 195.

שָׁחַד *šāḥad*; שֹׁחַד *šōḥad*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences and Meaning in the OT: 1. Occurrences; 2. Meaning. III. OT Use: 1. Gifts; 2. Bribes. IV. 1. Talmud; 2. LXX and Qumran.

šāḥad. H. Donner, "Die soziale Botschaft der Propheten im Lichte der Gesellschaftsordnung in Israel," *OrAnt* 2 (1963) 229-45, esp. 233-38; G. Fohrer, "Zur Einwirkung der gesellschaftlichen Struktur Israels auf seine Religion," *Near Eastern Studies. FS W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 169-85; M. Goldberg, "The Story of the Moral: Gifts or Bribes in Deuteronomy?" *Int* 38 (1984) 15-25; K. Rennstich, *Korruption* (Stuttgart, 1990), esp. 143-47; A. Schenker, "*kōper* et

I. Etymology. There is little evidence in Semitic languages apart from the OT for the verbal root *šḥd* and the attendant noun *šōḥaḏ (nomen actionis)*[1]. In Akkadian (*šaḫādum*, "give as a gift"[2]) it is considered a Canaanite loanword; it does not occur at all in Ugaritic. By contrast, Aramaic seems to use it more frequently: Old Aramaic in Sefire *(wyšḥdn)*, and Imperial Aramaic in Elephantine *(šḥd)*.[3]

II. Occurrences and Meaning in the OT.

1. *Occurrences.* The vb. *šḥd* occurs only twice in the MT, then once in Sir. 35:14. By contrast, the noun *šōḥaḏ* is used much more frequently (23 times). One common expression combines *šōḥaḏ* with → לקח *lāqaḥ*, "take a bribe" (Ex. 23:8; Dt. 10:17; 16:19; 27:25; 1 S. 8:3; 2 Ch. 19:7; Ps. 15:5; Prov. 17:23; Ezk. 22:12; cf. also Isa. 1:23, *'ōhēḇ šōḥaḏ*); synonyms include *beṣa'* (1 S. 8:3; Isa. 33:15; Ezk. 22:12 [in this sense also in Ex. 18:21[4]]), *ma'ašqôṯ* (Isa. 33:15), and *šalmōnîm* (Isa. 1:23).

2. *Occurrences and Meaning in the OT.* Although the first meaning lexicons generally offer for the verb is "give a present" and for the noun, "gift," closer examination shows that the reference is never to the unintentional or aimless giving of gifts, as the following explications regarding the traditional renderings also show.[5] The idea is rather that of *do ut des*, "I give that you may give."[6] The variously adduced passages show, by the way, that the focus is on the second meaning, namely, "to bribe; a bribe." Despite this rather concrete meaning, the root does have theological relevance, incorporating as it does within legal, prophetic, and wisdom literature the rejection of this vice and accentuating the confession to God, with whom there is doubtless much grace and compassion to be had (cf. Ex. 34:6; Ps. 103:8; etc.) but certainly no susceptibility to bribery as among human beings.

III. OT Use.

1. *Gifts.* What was said above about the meaning of the verb "give as a gift" and of the noun "gift" is confirmed by the following passages. Ezekiel presents Israel as a whore and accuses her not only of — as was customary — demanding pay for her services, but also of offering a gift (of money) to tempt customers in the first place (Ezk. 16:33). Regarding the expression *ûmikkōḥ*ª*ḵem šiḥ*ª*ḏû ḇa'*ª*ḏî* in Job 6:22, G. Fohrer sug-

---

expiation," *Bibl* 63 (1982) 32-46, esp. 38-39; H. Tadmor and M. Cogan, "Ahaz and Tiglath-Pileser in the Book of Kings: Historiographic Considerations," *Bibl* 60 (1979) 491-508, esp. 499-503.

1. *BLe*, § 61 1''.
2. *AHw*, III, 1128.
3. Sefire III 28 = *KAI* 224.28; *AP*, 37.4; on Jewish Aramaic see *WTM*, IV, 529-30; on Bab. *Ketub.* 105b see IV.1 below.
4. → בצע *bṣ'*, II, 207-8.
5. Cf. *GesB*, 817; *HAL*, IV, 1456-57. See III.1; cf. *DNSI*, II, 1120, s.v. *šḥd*, "bribe."
6. See *GesTh*, 1386, s.v. *šḥd:* alliciendi et corrumpendi causa; s.v. *šōḥaḏ:* munus donum quo poena redimitur vel quo aliquis, iudex maxime, corrumpitur.

gests that "it is not that he [Job] has asked for a sacrifice from their [his friends'] wealth so that perhaps he might have sufficient funds for bribery in case of an unfavorable legal case."[7] In Prov. 21:14, too, *šōḥaḏ* cannot be understood as a simple gift (par. *mattān*[8]), since the secret intention is to assuage the possibly justified wrath of an adversary.

The purpose of the "gifts" the kings of Judah send to the kings of Aram and Assyria (1 K. 15:19; 2 K. 16:8) is to prompt the latter's military intervention against otherwise superior hostile neighbors. A similar purpose seems to be at work in the unfortunately extremely fragmentary text of the treaty between King Bargayah of *KTK* and King Mattiel of Arpad: "and they bring gifts; every king who. . . ."[9]

Isa. 45:13 belongs in this context. Yahweh need employ neither payment *(mᵉḥîr)* nor bribe *(šōḥaḏ)* to prompt the Persian king Cyrus to act on Israel's behalf — a testament to Yahweh's sovereignty.

2. *Bribes.* The *Sitz im Leben* (life setting) of the transgression of bribery is found primarily in legal materials. H. Donner emphasizes that ancient Israelite society probably provided scant occasion for this particular transgression (apart from Samuel's wayward sons in 1 S. 8:3; cf. 1 S. 12:3, which does, however, use the expression *kōp̄er*). Such came rather from the employment of officials from the Canaanite population in administrative and legal positions.[10] Without mentioning bribery as such, Fohrer finds in the rise of the money economy the basis for the collapse of the "order of human coexistence in the sense that, because each was accorded his own, justice ruled."[11]

Such becomes clear in the prohibition and condemnation of bribery in the OT legal materials themselves (Ex. 23:8; Dt. 16:19; 27:25; cf. Ps. 15:5; 26:10; similarly Isa. 33:15) as well as in the severe accusations of the prophets Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Micah (Isa. 1:23; 5:23; Ezk. 22:12; Mic. 3:11). Dt. 27:25 proclaims the moral repugnance of such practice: *'ārûr lōqēaḥ šōḥaḏ;* its logical consequence is the perversion of justice (*hiṭṭâ mišpāṭ,* Dt. 16:19; 1 S. 8:3; Prov. 17:23), oppressions (*ma'ᵃšaqqôṯ,* Isa. 33:15), and disgraceful deeds (*zimmâ,* Ps. 26:10). Though such bribery might indeed exert its effect for a moment (Prov. 17:8: "a bribe is like a magic stone in the eyes of those who give it; wherever they turn they prosper"[12]), its refusal is also conceivable (Prov. 6:35). Ultimately, however, bribery does not bring happiness to those who employ it (Job 15:34). Although human behavior varies with regard to bribery, Yahweh certainly cannot be bribed (Dt. 10:17; 2 Ch. 19:7; Sir. 35:14).

IV. 1. *Talmud.* The spiritual and thus severe understanding of bribery in the Talmud tractate *Ketub.* 105b is both illuminating and significant. "Our Rabbis taught: *And thou*

---

7. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 173.

8. → נתן *nāṯan,* X, 90-108.

9. Sefire III 28 = *KAI* 224.28; see *KAI,* II, 266; *ANET,* 659-61, here 661b ("and they bribe whatever king who").

10. Donner, 235-36, 238.

11. Fohrer, "Einwirkung," 185.

12. See B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* I/16 (²1963), 72.

shalt take no gift; there was no need to speak of [the prohibition of] a gift of money, but [this was meant:] Even a bribe of words is also forbidden, for Scripture does not write, *And thou shalt take no gain.* What is to be understood by 'a bribe of words'? — As the bribe offered to Samuel. He was once crossing [a river] on a board when a man came up and offered him his hand. 'What,' [Samuel] asked him, 'is your business here?' — 'I have a lawsuit,' the other replied. 'I,' came the reply, 'am disqualified from acting for you in the suit.'"[13] This manner of interpretation strongly recalls the "antitheses" of Jesus' Sermon on the Mount, where, for example, insults and curses are equated with murder (Mt. 5:21-22).

2. *LXX and Qumran.* In the majority of passages the LXX translates *šōḥaḏ* as *dṓron* (Dt. 10:17; Ps. 15:5; in Prov. 6:35 Aquila has *dōrokopía,* Symmachus also in Ps. 26:10), only in Job 15:34 does it use *dōrodéktēs.* In Prov. 17:8 the LXX translates *šōḥaḏ* as *misthós charítōn.* In Sir. 35(32):14 the vb. *šḥd* is rendered as *dōrokopeín,* in Ezk. 16:33 as *prosdidónai* or *didónai misthṓmata,* while in Job 6:22 the rendering of *šḥd* as *epideín* alters the statement somewhat.

The only occurrence in Qumran thus far is the noun *šwḥd* in the Temple Scroll (4 times). The regulation in Dt. 16:18-19 (11QT 51:12-13) is enhanced with a death sentence (51:17-18). The same prohibition of a perversion of justice and bribery is integrated into the expanded royal law (57:20).

Beyse

13. Trans. from Soncino Talmud, III (London, 1959). Cf. L. Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud,* IV (Berlin, 1933), 808.

שחח *šḥḥ;* שוח *šwḥ;* שיח *šyḥ;* שָׁחָה *šāḥâ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Statistics. III. Synonyms. IV. Use: 1. Secular; 2. Theological; 3. *šyḥ.* V. LXX and Qumran.

šḥḥ. F. Huber, *Jahwe, Juda und die anderen Völker beim Propheten Jesaja. BZAW* 137 (1976), esp. 166-69.

I. Etymology. The verbal root *šḥḥ* is attested in East and West Semitic, including Akk. *šaḫāḫu(m),* "come loose, fall out, dwindle, waste away," to be distinguished from *šuḫeḫunu,* "prostrate oneself, throw oneself down" (Amarna letters).[1] The root is also attested in Qumran and Middle Hebrew with the meaning "bend down."[2]

Secondary forms include *šwḥ, šyḥ,* and *šḥh* (attested only twice: the qal in Isa. 51:23, "bow down"; the hiphil in Prov. 12:25, "bend, weigh down").[3] Because the root is largely attested in only substantival forms, the Hebrew verbal forms of *šwḥ* and *šyḥ* can probably be attributed to *šḥḥ.*[4] In Arabic, *šwḥ* is attested as *sāḫa,* "sink (into the ground/muck)," in Moabite as *'šwḥ,* comparable to the substantival parallels to *šûḥâ/šîḥâ,* "pit, trap," in numerous Semitic languages, e.g., already as Akk. *šaḫu(m)/šīḫu(m),* "a (washing) basin."[5] In the OT, Prov. 2:18 (hapax legomenon) refers to the house of the "strange" (adulterous) woman, which "sinks down" to death and thus brings death to all who go to her (cf. v. 19; J. A. Emerton reads *šuḥâ,* "pit," instead of *šāḥâ*[6]). The meaning of Akk. *šaḫāḫu,* "come loose" (see above), already signals the etymological connection of *šyḥ* with *šāḥâ;* the root *šyḥ* is attested in Syriac (*šâ* II), Arabic *(sāḥa),* and Ethiopic *(sēḥa)* in the meaning "flow, melt away."[7] In the 5 (or 6? Lam. 3:20 *K*) OT occurrences, *šyḥ* qal (Ps. 44:26[Eng. 25]) means "melt away (into dust),"[8] hithpolel (Ps. 42:6,7,12[5,6,11]; 43:5), "be dissolved"; the subject is variously the *nepeš* of the people or of the psalmist. Although the roots *šḥḥ* and *šḥh* can indeed be related etymologically as variants, they are not semantic equivalents, since in the qal *šḥh* can also mean "prostrate oneself."

II. Statistics. Like *šwḥ* and *šyḥ,* so also *šḥḥ* occurs exclusively in poetic texts. Of the 18 occurrences of *šḥḥ,* 8 are in Isaiah, including 2 in authentic Isaianic passages (Isa. 2:17; 29:4), 2 in the Isaiah apocalypse (25:12; 26:5), and 1 in Trito-Isaiah (60:14). A second concentration is found in the psalms sphere, including 4 occurrences in laments of the individual (Ps. 10:10; 35:14; 38:7[6]; Lam. 3:20 *Q*), 1 in a thanksgiving liturgy (Ps. 107:39), and 1 in a hymnic context (Hab. 3:6). The term occurs 4 times in wisdom literature, including Prov. 14:19 (MT vocalizes *šāḥû,* insinuating thus, and probably correctly, a form of *šḥḥ*); Job 9:13; 38:40; Eccl. 12:4).

III. Synonyms. Synonyms include in 7 instances *špl* (esp. hiphil, "humiliate, bring low"), *ng'* hiphil, "lay low (to the ground)," *hlk šᵉḥōaḥ,* "come bent over" (par.

---

1. *AHw,* III, 1128; *HAL,* IV, 1458. On use in Amarna letters see *AHw,* III, 1263 s.v. *šukênu(m).*
2. On Qumran see V below; on Middle Hebrew see *ANH,* 419.
3. On *hištaḥᵃwâ* → חוה *ḥwh* (II.1), IV, 249-50; according to an explicit reference from W. von Soden, *hištaḥᵃwâ* (so also *HAL,* IV, 1457b) derives from *šāḥâ;* see von Soden, "Ist im AT schon vom Schwimmen die Rede?" *ZAH* 4 (1991) 167-68; → שחת *šāḥaṯ.*
4. Communication from B. Kienast; cf. also *KBL*², 965 s.v. *šyḥ;* a different view is taken by *HAL,* IV, 1457.
5. See, respectively, Wehr, 439; *KAI* 181.9; *AHw,* III, 1132-33.
6. "A Note on Proverbs II.18," *JTS* 30 (1979) 153-58.
7. See, respectively, *LexSyr,* 763; Wehr, 446; *LexLingAeth,* 392.
8. See *HAL,* IV, 1477b.

context of 2:9-11 justifies the catastrophe of 587 B.C.E., the verses probably also address the Israel of the period of the redactors themselves, an Israel similarly advised to understand itself as being under God's judgment.

Trito-Isaiah uses *šḥḥ* qal in connection with the prophecy of salvation: "The descendants of those who oppressed you shall come bending low to you *(wᵉhālᵉḵû 'ēlayiḵ šᵉḥôᵃḥ),* and all who despised you shall bow down at your feet *(hištaḥᵃwâ)*" (Isa. 60:14). The inf. *šᵉḥôaḥ* is to be understood as an adverbial accusative describing external features.[15] The severity of v. 14a toward foreign nations comes as something of a surprise in the overall context of Isa. 60 and thus should probably be deleted as secondary (with LXX).[16] The wisdom postulate of the act-consequence connection probably resonates in v. 14 (cf. Prov. 14:19). The goal of these events, however, is not the humiliation of earlier oppressors or Israel's own triumph, but rather the glorification of Jerusalem as the city of Yahweh (v. 14b).

The two occurrences of the hiphil of *šḥḥ* also point to theological usage, Isa. 26:5 directly, 25:12 indirectly, both within the framework of the Isaiah apocalypse, though the latter passage is presumably secondary. In hymnic praise of the mighty city (Jerusalem; 26:1-6) and within the overall framework of an eschatological liturgy, 26:5 maintains that Yahweh has "brought low" (*šḥḥ* hiphil) the "inhabitants of the height" *(yōšᵉḇê mārôm)* and "laid low" (*špl* hiphil) the "lofty city" *(qiryâ niśgāḇâ),* has "laid it low to the ground" (*ng'* hiphil). Whereas here the anonymous city is probably to be understood in a wholly general fashion, 25:12 (presumably a gloss to the secondary vv. 10b,11) refers to a Moabite city (capital?) whose anticipated fall is celebrated as having already occurred: "And your towering stronghold, with its walls, someone pushed down (*šḥḥ* hiphil), cast it down (*špl* hiphil), knocked it down, right to the ground *(ng'* hiphil *lā'āreṣ),* into the dust."[17] Despite the neutral "someone" (v. 12), the basic text of the unit (vv. 9-10a) shows that Yahweh is behind these events on Israel's behalf.

The use of the qal in Hab. 3:6 and, in imitation, in Job 9:13 are part of a theophany of judgment. In Habakkuk's visionary experience (3:3-15), Yahweh "shakes" the earth (*mwd* polel, "set into motion"), "makes the nations tremble" (*ntr* hiphil), during which the "eternal mountains" *(harᵉrê-'aḏ)* are "shattered" (*pṣṣ* hithpolel) and the "everlasting hills" *(giḇ'ôṯ 'ôlām)* "sink low" (v. 6). According to Job 9:13, God "will not turn back" (*šwb* hiphil) his "anger" *('appô),*[18] with the "helpers of Rahab" *('ōzᵉrê rāhaḇ),* i.e., Tiamat's comrades in Enuma Elish, already "bowed beneath him." An addendum to the thanksgiving liturgy in Ps. 107 (vv. 33-43), reflecting the problems in the country after the exile,[19] confesses or hopes for Yahweh's dominion over the country on behalf of the starving, dominion including the humiliation of the "princes" *(nᵉḏîḇîm):* "He pours contempt on princes and makes them wander in

15. See *GK,* §118q.
16. See C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 355.
17. Translation from H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. trans. 1997), 536.
18. See G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 198.
19. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), in loc.

trackless wastes (v. 40), such that they are 'diminished' *(m'ṭ),* 'brought low' through oppression, trouble, and sorrow" (v. 39; cf. NRSV). The use of *šḥḥ* niphal in Isa. 29:4 also is found in connection with judgment within the presumably Isaianic oracle of disaster against Ariel, i.e., Jerusalem, as the "city where David encamped" (v. 1) and to which Yahweh himself will lay siege (v. 3). Verse 4 then describes the laying low of Ariel/Jerusalem, which will be lying on the ground, "whimpering" (*dbr* piel), its words (actually sg. *'imrāṯēḵ*) "coming low" out of the dust (*šḥḥ* niphal; cf. Eccl. 12:4[20]).

3. *šyḥ.* The few occurrences of *šyḥ* are strikingly restricted to two adjacent psalms, Ps. 42/43 and 44. Within the context of a lament of the people, 44:26(25) tries to prompt Yahweh's help by drawing attention to the people's extreme humiliation despite their being unaware of any guilt: "For we *(napšēnû)* 'sink down' to the dust, our bodies cling *(dbq)* to the ground." In the refrain of the lament of the individual in Ps. 42/43 (42:6[5]; 43:5), the petitioner asks why his soul is so "cast down" and moans (cf. also 42:7[6]) in order to maintain hope in God.

V. LXX and Qumran. The LXX generally translates *šḥḥ* as *tapeinoún* and *kýptein,* though also as *katágein* (Isa. 26:5), *kakoún* (Ps. 106[107]:39), *olisthánein* (Prov. 14:19), *tḗkein* (Hab 3:6, *šḥḥ* niphal), *dýein* (Isa. 29:4, *šḥḥ* niphal), and in a psychologizing fashion with *deídein* (Isa. 60:14; Job 28:40).

The root occurs a few times in Qumran. It is unclear which punishable offense is meant in 1QS 7:15 (wave with the left hand? gesticulate? prop oneself up?).[21] By contrast, references to the "disturbance of the soul" (1QH 8:32) or to the "laying low of the everlasting heights" (CD 1:15) have parallels in OT texts. 1Q25 3, 1; 4, 7 are fragmentary.

Ruppert

---

20. A different view is taken by G. R. Driver, "Notes on Isaiah," *Von Ugarit nach Qumran. FS O. Eissfeldt. BZAW* 77 (1958), 45.

21. See J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer,* II (Munich, 1960), 28-29.

שחט *šḥṭ*; שַׁחֲטָה *šaḥ*ᵃ*ṭâ*; שְׁחִיטָה *š*ᵉ*ḥîṭâ*

Contents: I. Etymology and Meaning. II. OT: 1. Animal Slaughter; 2. The Killing of Human Beings. III. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. Etymology and Meaning. The root *šḥṭ* is attested in all the important Semitic languages. The Akkadian term *šaḫāṭu(m)* II already bears the meaning "tear away, off, down, flay (skin)," as also suggested by Syr. *šaḥḥēṭ,* "destroy, scatter, wound," and by the Old Aramaic witnesses from Sefire ("be decimated").[1] In Ugaritic the root *šḫṭ* appears substantivally as *mšḫṭ* in reference to the slaughterer/butcher as well as to the knife or instrument used to kill an animal.[2]

The related Arabic vb. *saḥaṭa,* "slaughter,"[3] clearly points to a basic meaning "cut through (the throat)" (cf. *masḥaṭ,* "throat"). Finally, the occurrences in the Mishnah and Talmud also support this understanding; cf. also Eth. *saḥaṭa,* "to wound, harm."[4]

The vb. *šḥṭ* occurs 79 times, including 76 times in the qal and 3 in the niphal. The noun *š*ᵉ*ḥîṭâ* occurs in 2 Ch. 30:17, where it refers to the slaughtering of the Passover lambs.

Yet another substantival form, *šaḥ*ᵃ*ṭâ,* is found in Hos. 5:2, where one probably ought to maintain a meaning commensurate with the verb, "slaughter (to idols)."[5] Nonetheless, many commentators propose various textual emendations.[6]

Six additional occurrences of the qal participle attest a homonymous vb. *šḥṭ* and refer to metalworking (1 K. 10:16-17; 2 Ch. 9:15[bis],16; Jer. 9:7 *Q*). These occurrences are best understood as examples of an independent verbal stem *šḥṭ* II, which refers to metalworking (primarily gold) through hammering or beating.[7] In Jer. 9:7(8) *(Q)* the

---

šḥṭ. A. Bea, "Kinderopfer für Moloch oder für Jahwe?" *Bibl* 18 (1937) 95-107; J. A. Fitzmyer, "A Re-Study of an Elephantine Aramaic Marriage Contract (AP 15)," *Near Eastern Studies. FS W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 137-68; M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1978); G. C. Heider, *The Cult of Molek. A Reassessment. JSOTSup* 43 (1985); R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967); M. S. Smith, *The Early History of God* (San Francisco, 1990); N. H. Snaith, "The Verbs *zābaḥ* and *šāḥaṭ,*" *VT* 25 (1975) 242-46; J.-M. de Tarragon, *Le Culte à Ugarit. CahRB* 19 (1980); R. de Vaux, *Studies in OT Sacrifice* (Cardiff, 1964).

1. See *AHw,* III, 1131; *CAD,* XVII/I, 92-95; *LexSyr,* 768; *KAI* 222A.32; *DNSI,* II, 1122.
2. Cf. *WUS,* no. 2594; *UT,* no. 2401; see also B. Margalit, "Lexicographical Notes on the *Aqht* Epic (Part I: KTU 1.17-18)," *UF* 15 (1983) 102.
3. *GesB,* 818; *HAL,* IV, 1458.
4. On rabbinic references see O. Michel, "σφάζω," *TDNT,* VII, 933; on Ethiopic cf. *LexLingAeth,* 332-33; *WbTigr,* 171.
5. So F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, *Hosea. AB*24 (1980), 386f.
6. See the list in W. R. Harper, *Amos and Hosea. ICC* (1905; repr. 1966), 267-68; W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966), 116; cf. also G. R. Driver, "Studies in the Vocabulary of the OT. V," *JTS* 34 (1933) 40, who construes a new word with the meaning "corruption, fornication."
7. See Snaith, 245.

prophet compares a deceitful tongue with a polished or sharpened arrow (NRSV "a deadly arrow"). Here the root *šḥṭ* II should be clearly distinguished from *šḥṭ* I.[8]

The basic meaning of all occurrences of *šḥṭ* I is "(mortally) beat down; slaughter." Accordingly, the basic meaning of Heb. *šḥṭ* I must refer to the process of such slaughtering of people or animals, usually by slitting the throat. The vb. *šḥṭ* is probably unsuitable for describing such killing by means of a blow with a blunt weapon and without spilling blood. The closest synonyms are *hrg,* "kill" (usually in noncultic contexts; cf. Isa. 22:13); *zbḥ,* which refers in the broader sense to the killing of animals as sacrifice; and *nhk* hiphil, "kill, strike dead" (cf. Isa. 66:3).

The verb is used, on the one hand, to refer to the slaughtering of animals, usually in order to use their bodies or blood in cultic rites, and, on the other, to refer to the killing of people, usually more as passive captives than in the heat of battle.

II. OT.

1. *Animal Slaughter.* The majority of passages using the vb. *šḥṭ* describe the ritual killing of animals for the cult (Lev. 17:3[bis]; Nu. 11:22; 1 S. 1:25; 14:32; Isa. 22:13). The use of the verb in Gen. 37:31, however, shows that its meaning is not limited to this context. Here Joseph's brothers slaughter a goat in order to dip Joseph's robe in its blood. Nonetheless, in the overwhelming number of passages, the verb refers to the slaughtering of animals in connection with cultic acts, since the spilling of blood (human or animal) was viewed as an intrusion into the divine dominion over life (Gen. 9:6; Lev. 17:10-13).

Snaith attributes 38 occurrences to P in which the killing of an animal is part of the cultic rite of presenting various kinds of sacrifices.[9] In Ezk. 40–48, four passages refer to the killing of animals as burnt offerings (40:39,41,42; 44:11). The verb is also used in the Chronicler's History in connection with the presentation of sin offerings (2 Ch. 29:22[ter],24) or with the slaughtering of the Passover lamb (2 Ch. 30:15,17; 35:1,6,11). The uniform nature of such use shows that the Israelite priestly regulations understood *šḥṭ* as a technical term referring to the quick (and humane?) killing of an animal through slitting the throat; the animal's body and blood were then used in ritual acts.

It is significant that despite the frequent use of the verb, the OT offers no exact description of just how this "slaughtering" was carried out, as also clearly evident in the rabbinic embarrassment at being unable to adduce any useful scriptural witnesses for their slaughtering methods (cf. Bab. *Ḥul.* 27a,b).[10]

One important occasion for such ritual killing was Passover (*pesaḥ;* cf. Ex. 12:6,21; 2 Ch. 30:15; 35:1,6,11; Ezra 6:20). Similarly, animals used for burnt sacrifices (*'ōlâ)* had to be slaughtered before the body could be burned as an offering (Ex. 29:16; Lev. 1:5,11; 4:33 [niphal]; 6:18[25]; 7:2; 8:19; 9:12; 14:19). The same applies to the sin of-

---

8. But cf. *HAL,* IV, 1459-60.
9. Snaith, 244. Cf. J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16. AB* 3 (1964), 154-55.
10. See in this regard O. Michel, *TDNT,* VII, 930.

The vb. *šḥṭ* is used more frequently to describe the killing of political adversaries, religious enemies, and other important captives. In Jgs. 12:6 the men of Gilead slaughter Ephraimite refugees at a ford of the Jordan when the victims are exhausted and defenseless. In 1 K. 18:40 Elijah orders the prophets of Baʿal to be slaughtered after the spectacular demonstration of Yahweh's power on Carmel.

2 K. 10:7 recounts the slaughter of Ahab's seventy sons in Samaria. Jehu also slaughtered an additional forty-two men, all of whom were relatives of King Ahaziah of Judah (2 K. 10:14). The circumstances in both stories show that the unfortunate victims, who were in fact captives, could not put up any resistance to the slaughter. A similar situation recurs in Jer. 41:7, where followers of Gedaliah, the governor of Judah, are murdered by Ishmael, a man of royal lineage. 2 K. 25:7 par. Jer. 39:6; 52:10 describes the slaughter of the sons of the Judean king Zedekiah and other Judean notables at the behest of the Babylonian military leadership.

In an expanded sense, the Israelites accuse God of wanting to slaughter them in the wilderness (Nu. 14:16).

In all these accounts in which people are killed or threatened with death, the context reveals that the victim or victims had absolutely no chance to defend themselves. In these cases, they were probably slaughtered quickly by means of a sword or dagger.

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX largely translates the verb with the word group *spházein/ sphagḗ* (65 times, including all the occurrences in Leviticus),[14] using the vb. *thýein* in the remaining occurrences (esp. Chronicles), thus emphatically documenting the semantic proximity with → זבח/טבח *zāḇaḥ/ṭāḇaḥ*. For the slaughter of the Passover lamb, the LXX uses the expression *thýein tó phásek* (cf. 2 Ch. 30:15,17).

2. *Qumran.* Given the frequent use of the verb in the OT priestly writings, one would expect the verb to enjoy similarly widespread use in Qumran. How surprising, then, to discover that the root does not appear at all in the great scrolls, not even in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, a situation possibly deriving from the reinterpretation of the sacrificial cult in Qumran into a cult of prayer. A third of the 12 total occurrences (including as yet unpublished material) are found in the Temple Scroll, another third in the letter of the teacher 4QMMT. Every passage involves the ritual slaughter of sacrificial animals, either on the Day of Atonement (11QT 26:5), at the feast of the new oil (22:4), or the wood offering (23:11). The teacher's halakah uses the term once in connection with purity regulations (4Q394 I, 17-18 = 4QMMT 13-14) and in regulations regarding the appropriate place of slaughter (II, 15-16 = 4QMMT 27-28). No slaughter may take place in the temple itself (4Q396 I, 1 = 4QMMT 35, par. *zāḇaḥ;* contra Lev. 1:5; 17:1-9, etc.). The remaining passages 4Q270 9, II, 15 (doublet to CD) and 4Q276 1-2 (purification regulations) are fragmentary.

Clements

---

14. See O. Michel, *TDNT,* VII, 925-38.

שָׁחַק *šāḥaq*; שַׁחַק *šaḥaq*

Contents: I. Cognates. II. OT Occurrences: 1. Verb; 2. Noun: a. Theophany; b. Yahweh's Incomparability; c. Yahweh's Creative Acts; d. Yahweh's Salvific Acts in History. III. Qumran. IV. LXX.

I. Cognates. As a verb meaning "grind, crush, smooth out," the root *šḥq* has parallels in Egyptian Aramaic, Imperial Aramaic, Syriac, and Christian Palestinian Aramaic, as well as in Akkadian as *šêqu(m)*, and in Arabic as *saḥaqa.*[1]

The substantive, "cloud," also has parallels in Jewish Aramaic, Christian Palestinian, and Mandaic equivalents as well as in Akk. *šīqu(m)* and Arabic.[2]

Although J. Blau may be correct that the verbal and substantival use are based on two homonymous roots,[3] it is more likely that the subst. *šḥq* acquired its meaning based on the consistency of clouds and thus that no separate derivation is necessary.

II. OT Occurrences. The root *šḥq* occurs most frequently in the poetic texts of Job and the Psalms. It does not occur in narrative texts. As both a verb and a noun, *šḥq* expresses the idea of the production of very fine particles or the idea of an object consisting of such particles.

1. *Verb.* The vb. *šḥq* occurs 4 times, always in the qal. According to Ex. 30:36, Moses is to beat a spice mixture into a fine powder and then take it into the holy tent, where Yahweh will meet with him. In Ps. 18:43(42) (almost verbatim parallel in 2 S. 22:43), the psalmist gives thanks for a rescue during which, in part, he beat his adversaries "fine, like dust before the wind." Here, then, *šḥq* appears in positive contexts. By contrast, Job's reference to the way "the waters wear away the stones, the torrents wash away the soil of the earth" (Job 14:19) is an expression of hopelessness in that he finds in the gradual crushing of the stones an analogy to his own condition.

Sir. 42:4 is not quite clear. G. Sauer believes that *šḥq* refers to the cleaning of money scales.[4] Although the expression used here could refer to dust or dirt (noun) on the scales (cf. Isa. 40:15; see below), contextually the admonition to exercise caution in dealing with others seems to imply the action of cleansing (verb).

šāḥaq. B. Holmberg, "Herren oh Molnet i Gamla testamentet," *SEÅ* 48 (1983) 31-47; C. Houtman, *Der Himmel im AT. Israels Weltbild und Weltanschauung. OTS* 30 (1993), esp. 20-24; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie. WMANT* 10 ([2]1977), 9; H. Torczyner, "The Firmament and the Clouds," *ST* 1 (1948) 188-96.

1. Cf. *DNSI,* II, 1121; *AHw,* III, 1215; Wehr, 400.
2. See *HAL,* IV, 1464-65 (bibliog.).
3. J. Blau, *Hebrew Language Studies. FS Z. Ben-Ḥayyim* (Jerusalem, 1983), 76-77.
4. G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach. JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 608.

2. *Noun.* Isa. 40:15 uses the noun *šaḥaq* in a completely unique fashion. The parallel use of *daq* suggests that the reference is to dust on the scales. The nations are compared with such dust and with the drop from a bucket to underscore their meaninglessness, while Yahweh's own incomparable meaning is emphasized in contrast.

God's grandeur, majesty, incomparability, and distance from human beings are also the focus in the following texts that use *šaḥaq* in the sense of "cloud." All these passages also resonate with the notion of Baʿal as the one who is enthroned or appears in the clouds.

a. *Theophany.* The noun often appears in connection with theophanies. Ps. 18:12(11) (almost verbatim parallel in 2 S. 22:12) employs elements of theophany portrayals[5] in recounting how, when the petitioner was in need, Yahweh made dark waters and thick clouds into his canopy in a demonstration of his power. "The accumulation of imagery enhances the notion of Yahweh's mobility and hence ubiquity."[6] There is no reason to eliminate precisely the passages using *šaḥaq* because of an alleged overloading of the verse.[7] Ps. 77:18(17) also contains elements of theophanies. In praising Yahweh (from v. 14[13]), the psalmist recounts how the "clouds poured out water" and "the skies thundered." The reference in 68:35(34) to Yahweh's power above the clouds, a statement that with others praises Yahweh's majesty, also belongs in the larger context of theophany portrayal of Ps. 68 (vv. 5,8-9,34[4,7-8,33]).[8]

Elihu's discourse in Job 37:21 provides a kind of transition to the following theophany portrayal. Elihu underscores the futility of Job's statements by pointing out how one cannot "look on the light" that shines so brightly in the clouds, a possible allusion to the revelation of God in the following theophany.

b. *Yahweh's Incomparability.* Reference is often made to *šaḥaq* in connection with Yahweh's incomparability. The rhetorical question in Ps. 89:7(6) asks who in the clouds can compare with Yahweh (the unique use of *šaḥaq* is to be understood as an example of ancient poetic usage[9]). "This is the only instance in the OT where the comparative 'material' is clearly and unquestionably the heavenly host."[10] The statement in 89:7(6) may indeed be based on the idea of a disempowerment of the pantheon of gods.[11] Here reference to Yahweh's incomparability is made within a hymnic context that in its own turn appears within the broader context of a lament; as such, it underscores the urgency of the lament by drawing attention to earlier salvific acts (cf. also 77:15-21[14-20]).

Dt. 33:26 introduces the conclusion to the Song of Moses by extolling the incomparability of the God of Jeshurun who comes to help, who is "majestic" upon the clouds.

---

5. See Jeremias, esp. 88-90.
6. F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger, *Psalmen I. NEB* 29 (1993), 126.
7. So H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), on Ps. 18.
8. See in this regard Jeremias, 148.
9. So G. W. Ahlström, *Psalm 89* (Lund, 1959), 58.
10. C. J. Labuschagne, *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the OT. POS* 5 (1966), 79.
11. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150. CC* (Eng. trans. 1989), in loc.

3:13 compares the pangs of birth preceding the miracle of successful delivery with, among other things, the loud roaring of the clouds. Here, as in Jer. 51:9, the context of *šḥq* is not primarily a salvific one even though the end or goal of such birth is indeed positive. Although the occurrence in 1QH 6:16 is obscure, K. G. Kuhn does reconstruct it as *šḥqym.*[16]

The fragmentary verse 4Q370 1, 9 uses the noun in connection with the Flood narrative.[17] Whereas Gen. 9 itself does not use *šḥq,* the Qumran text speaks about the *šḥqym* after the end of the flood and the reference to the rainbow. Hence *šḥq* once again relates to God's salvific deeds. Other fragmentary occurrences include 4Q381 19, I, 3, where *šḥq* more likely means "heaven" (cf. Job 37:18; 1QM 10:11), and 4Q402 4, 10, which mentions the divine beings in the heavenly war *(bmlḥmt šḥqym).*

IV. LXX. The LXX renders *šḥq* with many different Greek terms, though none seems to express any particular theological nuances. The most frequent rendering is *nephélē* and *néphos,* both of which are used with similar frequency to translate **ענן** *'ānān.*

No purely secular use of *šaḥaq* is attested. When *šaḥaq* is not being used to refer to God's majesty, either the narrower or broader context variously involves God's salvific activity. Except for Job 14:19; Jer. 51:9; and 1QH 3:13, *šaḥaq* is not used in negative contexts, and even these passages (apart from Job 14:19) stand within the larger context of divine salvific activity.

Hausmann

16. Kuhn, 219.
17. See in this regard C. A. Newsom, "4Q370: An Admonition Based on the Flood," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 23-43.

שָׁחַר *šāḥar* I; שָׁחֹר *šāḥōr;* שְׁחוֹר *šᵉḥôr;* שְׁחַרְחֹר *šᵉḥarḥōr*

The verb is a hapax legomenon. According to Job 30:30, Job's skin "turns black" (from skin disease). Comparable forms include the subst. *šᵉḥôr,* "blackness, soot"

šāḥar I: R. Gradwohl, *Die Farben im AT. BZAW* 83 (1963), esp. 51-53; V. Sasson, "King Solomon and the Dark Lady in the Song of Songs," *VT* 39 (1989) 407-14, esp. 411ff.; Wagner, esp. 112-13.

(Lam. 4:8); the adj. *šāḥôr* (6 times), "black," in Lev. 13:31 (cj. *ṣāhôḇ* [?][1]),37 (hair); esp. Cant. 1:5 (skin color: [sun] burned); 5:11 (raven); Zech. 6:2,6 (horse); also 2 occurrences in Qumran: 3Q15 12, 2 (basalt[?][2]) and 4Q186 2, I, 1 (eye color); similarly *šᵉḥarḥōr,* "blackish" (Cant. 1:6), and the subst. *šaḥᵃrûṯ,* "black hair"[?] (Eccl. 11:10).

The verb is attested in Middle Heb. hiphil = Jewish Aramaic aphel with the meaning "become black," several times as Syr. *šᵉḥar* and as Mand. *šḥr* II aphel with the meaning "be/become black."[3]

Although the verb might derive from the adjective, the excellent attestation in Syriac militates against this hypothesis. Just as Akk. *šaḫurru,* "rigid, stiff," derives from the vb. *šuḫarruru* II, "be/become rigid, deathly still," so also *šāḥōr* could have followed such a development: "burned black; black."[4] The interpretation of *šḥr* as an original shaphel from *ḥrr* I, "glow, burn, smolder," is improbable.[5] "Because the stem is attested only during the exilic/postexilic period and yet seems well established in Aramaic, it may represent an Aramaism."[6]

The LXX translates the verb as *melanoústhai,* the adjective as *mélas.*

Ruppert

---

1. See Gradwohl, 52.
2. Cf. *DJD,* III, 239-40; Wagner, 112-13.
3. See *ANH,* 420; *LexSyr,* 770; *MdD,* 451.
4. Communication from B. Kienast. See *AHw,* III, 1133, 1260-61.
5. P. A. H. de Boer, "Notes on Text and Meaning of Isaiah XXXVIII 9-20," *OTS* 9 (1951) 181; cf. L. Wächter, "Reste von Šafel-Bildungen im Hebräischen," *ZAW* 83 (1971) 384.
6. Wagner, 113.

שָׁחַר *šāḥar* II

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Synonyms. III. Occurrences. IV. Meaning: 1. Secular Use; 2. Theological Use; V. LXX and Qumran.

šāḥar II: L. Díez Merino, "Il vocabolario relativo alla 'Ricerca di Dio' nell' AT. La radice *šḥr,*" *BeO* 25 (1983) 35-38; O. García de la Fuente, *La búsqueda de Dios en el AT* (Madrid, 1971), esp. 25-26, 41-42; R. Martin-Achard, "Esaïe 47 et la tradition prophétique sur Babylone," *Prophecy. FS G. Fohrer. BZAW* 150 (1980), 83-105.

I. Etymology. This root is attested in Akk. *saḫāru(m),* "turn toward, go around, seek; stay"; similarly also in Middle Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic, and in Mand. *ŠHR* III, "seek, explore."[1] Comparable terms include OSA *šāḥir,* "the revolving one," an epithet of the lunar god.[2] In two passages, Isa. 47:11 (*šaḥrāh,* probably piel inf. from *šaḥ^a rāh*[3]) and 47:15 (cj. *šōḥ^a rāyik;* MT: *sōḥ^a rayik,* "your traders, merchants"[4]), *šḥr* means "do magic," "cause (it) to disappear by magic," or as a participle, "sorcerer, magician." Alongside a derivation from *šḥr* II, *HAL* considers a denomination of this piel from a subst. *šaḥar* III to be possible, since *AHw* also adduces the meaning "encircle (particularly in the context of magic or sorcery), bewitch" (cf. *sāḫiru[m],* "turning around," Neo-Babylonian, "a sorcerer," fem. *sāḫertu[m],* "a sorceress"; also Arab. *saḥara,* "bewitch, enchant, fascinate"; *sāḥir,* "sorcerer, enchanter, magician, charmer").[5] Nonetheless, semantic considerations by no means require the assumption of an additional root; *šḥr* acquires the meaning "bewitch, enchant" simply by way of the magical practices expressed in the meaning "encircle, said of magic or sorcery."[6]

II. Synonyms. Synonyms for *šḥr* include: *'wh* piel, "wish, desire"; *'hb,* "love"; *bqš* piel, "seek"; *ḥnn* hithpael, "plead for mercy/compassion"; *qr',* "call"; *šwb,* "turn around." Successful *šḥr* can be expressed by *mṣ',* "find" (Prov. 7:15). Apart from Prov. 11:27 and Isa. 47:15 cj. (qal ptcp.), only piel forms are attested.[7] The root *šḥr* expresses an intensive activity, "being intent upon something" (qal), "searching (diligently) for something" (piel). Objects of such seeking include God (with *nota accusativi* as well as with *'el*), wisdom (Job 7:21: God himself as subj.), the simple-minded man (Prov. 7:15; subj.: the strange woman); with the dative also: robbery (Job 8:5); with double accusative *šiḥ^a rô mûsār* (Prov. 13:24), "he seeks him with discipline," i.e., "he occasionally disciplines him [his son]."[8]

III. Occurrences. Considering that 8 of the 14 occurrences (with cj.) are found in wisdom writings (Prov. 1:28; 7:15; 8:17; 11:27; 13:24; Job 7:21; 8:5; 24:5), *šḥr* II emerges as a popular term among wisdom authors. There are 3 occurrences in the Psalms and psalmlike texts (Ps. 63:2[1]; 78:34; Isa. 26:9). The earliest occurrence that can be dated is Hos. 5:15, where Hosea explains the familiar cultic expression *bqš* (piel) *pānîm* (of Yahweh) with this wisdom term.[9] Preexilic texts include Prov. 11:27 and

---

1. *AHw,* II, 1005; *WTM,* IV, 537; *MdD,* 451.
2. See M. Höfner, in H. Gese, Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 282, 326.
3. See Bergsträsser, II, §22c.
4. *KBL*², 962; *HAL,* II, 750a; also IV, 1466a.
5. *HAL,* IV, 1466; → שחר *šaḥar; AHw,* II, 1005, 1008-9; Wehr, 400.
6. See *CAD,* XV, 46, with documentation; on the entire semantic spectrum see 37-38.
7. See *HP,* 222.
8. Cf. *KBL*², 962; G. R. Driver, "Hebrew Notes on Prophets and Proverbs," *JTS* 41 (1940) 174; cf. comms., esp. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 157, 164; on the obj. *mûsār,* cf. also *GK,* §113; *Synt.,* §94b.
9. See H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 116.

I. Etymology. The Heb. *šaḥar* is a primary noun.[1] The Akk. *šēru(m)* II and Assyr. *šiāru(m)*,[2] "morning," militate against a verbal derivation, since the substantival form *pirâs* generates only primary nouns;[3] moreover, OSA *śaḥar*, "dawn, daybreak," does not indicate a causative.[4] Forms occurring in Qumran include Middle Heb. *šaḥar* (1QH 4:6: *kšḥr*, "like the dawn"; 11QPs[a] 26:11: establishment of the dawn [*kwn* hiphil]; 4Q487 36,1 *lšḥr*, uncertain); Jewish Aram. *šaḥ[a]rā'*, "morning dawn, early morning";[5] Moab. (fem.!) *šḥrt;* cf. *mbq' hšḥrt*, "from daybreak";[6] Ugar. *šḥr*, "dawn, daybreak," *šḥr* par. *qdm*, "east wind";[7] *šḥr 'lmt*, "from this morning to eternity";[8] as the twin gods *šḥr wšlm*, "morning and evening star,"[9] and *'m šḥr wšlm šmmh*, "to *šḥr* and *šlm* in heaven";[10] Arab. *saḥar*, "time before daybreak, early morning, dawn."[11] The ancient Arabic god *saḥar*, "dawn, daybreak," is portrayed in reliefs with the symbol of the dragonhead.[12] The form *šaḥar* also appears as a *nomen divinum* in personal names, including Ugar. *ilšḥr*, "*šḥr* is (my) god"; Phoen. *'bdšḥr, šḥrb'l*.[13]

II. Meaning. There is still some dispute concerning just which early morning natural phenomenon is meant by *šḥr:* "daybreak, morning twilight," or "reddish glow that precedes the dawn, sunrise," or "the first morning light."[14] Since the word "dawn" also includes a stage of daybreak, the time of early morning twilight before the sun rises,

---

Creation in the OT (Philadelphia, 1984); P. Humbert, "Démesure et chute dans l'AT," *Maqqél shâqedh. FS W. Vischer* (Montpellier, 1960), 63-82; B. Janowski, *Rettungsgewissheit und Epiphanie des Heils I. WMANT* 59 (1989), esp. 182-91; J. W. McKay, "Helel and the Dawn-Goddess," *VT* 20 (1970) 451-64; idem, "Psalms of Vigil," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 229-47, esp. 243; H. G. May, "Some Aspects of Solar Worship at Jerusalem," *ZAW* 55 (1937) 269-81; M. H. Pope, "*'Aṯtar*," *WbMyth*, I, 249-50; idem, "*Šaḥr* und *Šalim*," *WbMyth*, I, 306-7; H.-P. Stähli, *Solare Elemente im Jahweglauben des AT. OBO* 66 (1985), esp. 34-35; J. Ziegler, "Die Hilfe Gottes 'am Morgen,'" *Alttestamentliche Studien. FS F. Nötscher. BBB* 1 (1950), 281-88.

1. Contra C. J. Labuschagne, *OT Studies* (Pretoria, 1971), 56, who derives it from *ḥrr* I shaphel, "make glow."
2. *AHw*, III, 1219, 1226.
3. See *GaG*, §55j, 12a.
4. Communication from B. Kienast.
5. *WTM*, IV, 537; Jastrow, 1551-52.
6. *KAI* 181.15; cf. *DNSI*, II, 1122.
7. *WUS*, no. 2592; *UT*, no. 2399; *KTU* 1.12, I, 7(8); cf. M. J. Dahood, *RSP*, I, 349.
8. *KTU* 3.5, 15; *WUS*, no. 2592.
9. *KTU* 1.23, 52, 53; cf. H. Gese, in Gese, M. Höfner, and K. Rudolph, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 80-82.
10. *KTU* 1.100 51, 52; cf. M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Die Bannung von Schlangengift," *UF* 12 (1980) 157.
11. Wehr, 400.
12. Cf. M. Höfner, *Religionen Altsyriens*, 253, 271-72; here 317; on Akk. *šēru(m)* as a *nomen divinum*, "morning star," see *AHw*, III, 1219.
13. *PNU*, 95, 192, 370; Benz, 163, 180.
14. On the first see Robertson; also Aalen, → I, 153-54, 165-66; on the second, Köhler; on the last, Dalman, *AuS*, I/2 (1928), 601; W. Rudolph, *Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 51.

while *šaḥar* refers to a (fleeting) *light* phenomenon, concretely to an "emerging" reddish light on the (eastern) horizon (vb. *'lh*[15]) or to the time when it appears, the term is probably best understood as "the first morning light" in the broader, albeit imprecise sense of the reddish light at dawn, which has nothing to do with the occasional morning redness in northern latitudes.[16] Whereas Heb. *šaḥar* is already considered to be part of the day itself (cf. Jgs. 19:25; Neh. 4:15), the corresponding Arab. *saḥar* refers to the final part of the night, which is then followed by the *faǧr,* that which is more properly called dawn.[17]

III. Problematic Passages. The meaning of *šaḥar* is disputed in Isa. 8:20, "for teaching and for instruction *(l^etôrâ w^elit'ûḏâ) 'im-lō' yō'm^erû kaddāḇār hazzeh ^a šer 'ên-lô šaḥar.*" Does *dāḇār* refer to "for teaching and instruction" ("those who do not keep to this [to Dt. 18:9-15] have no future"[18]) — but then can *'mr* really mean "hold to something"? — or more likely to what was said in v. 19 (just as *yō'm^erû* in v. 20 seems to be picking up *yō'm^erû* from v. 19)? Although one can reposition v. 20abα (after v. 19a) and reinterpret *'el-^e lōhāyw* as singular, "their God" (for Israel: Yahweh),[19] yielding thereby a comprehensible text suggesting the meaning "dawn," neither Isaiah nor his redactors would have referred to the replies of ghosts and diviners (v. 19) as *tôrâ.* The dative *lô* in v. 20bβ thus probably refers not to the speaker in v. 20bα, but rather to *dāḇār* (v. 20bα). In that case, however, a different meaning must be assumed for *šaḥar,* not least because among the early versions only the Vg. reads *matutina lux* (cf. *BHK*). The term *šaḥar* might be understood from the perspective of Akk. *saḫāru(m),* "turn around (for the purpose of sorcery, bewitchment)."[20] Because the dative *lô* (v. 20b) is too far removed to refer back to *yō'm^erû,* v. 20 should probably be translated, "By law and regulation! What they say has no force,"[21] the reference being to the "power of magic." Although *HAL* thus assumes the presence of a hapax legomenon *šaḥar* III with the meaning "magic, power (to bewitch maliciously),"[22] the root *šaḥar* III is probably not to be separated from *šāḥar* II. The obviously redactional, compound saying in Isa. 8:19-20 refers to practices forbidden by the Torah (cf. v. 20a; cf. Dt. 18:9-15). Strikingly, the adjuring asseveration refers less to the illegality of such practices than to their inefficiency: *'ên-lô šaḥar* (v. 20b).

It is virtually impossible to determine whether *mišḥār* in Ps. 110:3 *(mēreḥem mišḥār)* represents a substantive meaning "dawn" deriving from *šāḥar* II or is a result

15. See V.1 below.
16. See the extensive discussion in Köhler.
17. See Köhler, 59.
18. So R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–12. NEB* 17 (1986), 69.
19. So Schwarz, 219.
20. → שׁחר *šāḥar;* cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 364, 373-74; prompted by a suggestion from G. R. Driver, "Hebrew Notes on Prophets and Proverbs," *JTS* 41 (1940) 162; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1983), 199; H.-P. Müller, "Die weisheitliche Lehrerzählung im AT und seiner Umwelt," *WO* 8 (1975/76) 73-74.
21. Müller, 74.
22. *HAL,* IV, 1469.

the ascension of the son of Helios, Phaethon, on his father's sun chariot, an ascension that ends with Phaethon, struck by Zeus's thunderbolt, plunging into the Eridanus.[38] Establishing a connection with Eos, Greek dawn, requires an understanding of this particular Phaethon together with a different Phaethon, the son of Eos and Cephalus. If Phaethon is a Greek epithet for the morning star *(heōsphóros),* then *hêlēl* could be an epithet for Athtar,[39] though the genealogy does not fit even if *šaḥar* here (like Moab. *šḥrt*) were feminine.[40] The motif of gigantomachy also attested in Greek mythology might then provide the background to Isa. 14:12-15.[41] According to Craigie, *ben-šaḥar* refers not to genealogy but to the morning setting of the Venus star, in which case the genealogical problem would be solved.[42] Perhaps, however, the background is actually the simple astronomical observation that the morning star is able to rise only a little above the horizon before the rising sun makes it "disappear" from the observer's vision and prevents it from rising above the stars (cf. Isa. 14:13). The brightly shining star on the morning horizon thus appears as a fallen divine being and as such was able to refer metaphorically to a fallen being that tried to assault heaven.

This is the place to discuss the hapax legomenon *mišḥār* in Ps. 110:3 *(mēreḥem mišḥār),* even though an emendation to *šaḥar* on the basis of dittography might not prove persuasive.[43] Because OT Hebrew does not reliably attest a feminine meaning for anarthrous *šaḥar* ("dawn" as a goddess; contra McKay), Ps. 110:3 cannot really be interpreted as referring to the "birth" of the (Davidic) king from the womb of the dawn goddess. Here *mišḥār* probably has the same meaning as *šaḥar.*[44] But then what does "from the womb of the dawn" mean? Is the reference to begetting at all? The reading attested by the LXX (also Pesh. and several Hebrew mss.) *yᵉliḏtîḵā,* "I have begotten you," apparently represents an accommodation to Ps. 2:7, which is why the difficult MT reading should be maintained.[45] The deletion of *lᵉḵā ṭal,* "to you (the) dew," in the LXX suggests textual accommodation. One can thus translate: "On holy mountains, from the womb of the morning the dew of your youth [not: young manhood] (comes) to you."[46] The refreshing, vivifying dew of the early morning emerges, as it were, from the "womb" of dawn; i.e., the dawn "bestows" the dew, which functions here as a metaphor for the freshness of youth of the (chosen) king, or better yet as a metaphor for the divinely effected strengthening of the yet youthful king. All this takes place "on the holy mountains," i.e., on Zion.

One *crux interpretum* is the technical remark *ʿal-ʾayyeleṯ haššaḥar,* "according to

---

38. See H. von Geisan, *KlPauly,* IV, 689; also Grelot, 30-32.
39. See Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 64-65.
40. So McKay, "Helel," 458-60.
41. See Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 64.
42. Craigie, 224.
43. For: *KBL*², 573; against: *GesB,* 468; *HAL,* II, 644.
44. Cf. Stoebe, "Erwägungen," 188; *HAL,* II, 644.
45. Cf. H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 482-83; A. Weiser, *Psalms. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), in loc.; a different view is taken by Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* in loc.
46. See Gunkel, *HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 486.

the Deer of the Dawn," in Ps. 22:1(S), presumably an indication of melody.[47] Deleting *haššaḥar* and reading *ᵓᵉlāṯîṯ,* "according to the Elathite,"[48] seems arbitrary. Yet one probably did connect a sacred animal, a "deer, hind" or "doe of a fallow deer," to the dawn (originally to the deity?).[49] One might understand *ᵓayyeleṯ* as a feminine of *ᵓᵉyāl,* "strength" (Ps. 88:5[4]), which from the perspective of Syr. *ᵓiyālāᵓ,* "help," could also be understood as "help" as supported by LXX *hypér tḗs analḗmpseōs tḗs heōthinḗs,* "on the early morning help."[50] In any event, the psalm might later have been interpreted from the perspective of "help in the morning" (see above). Questionable readings include *ᵓᵉyālûṯ* (as in v. 20) as a feminine of *ᵓᵉyāl,* "(breath of) life" (?), "(to be sung) at the breathing of the dawn";[51] also the understanding of *ᵓayyeleṯ* as an "otherwise unattested feminine form *ᵓayil,* thus 'female sheep,'" which the petitioner must present as a sin offering at dawn.[52]

Names containing the term *šaḥar*[53] include the old place name *ṣereṯ haššaḥar* (Josh. 13:19), in which *šaḥar* probably represents a divine name; and the probably late PNs *ᵓᵃḥîšaḥar,* "my brother is *šaḥar*" (or "brother of *šaḥar*"?) (1 Ch. 7:10), *šᵉḥaryâ,* "Yahweh is *šaḥar*" (1 Ch. 8:26), in which *šaḥar* is probably to be understood metaphorically,[54] and finally *šaḥᵃrayim,* "born at the hour of *šaḥar*" (1 Ch. 8:8).[55]

Ruppert

---

47. Cf. ibid., 88; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59. CC* (Eng. trans. 1987), in loc.

48. H. Gunkel and J. Begrich, *Intro. to the Psalms* (Eng. trans., Macon, Ga., 1998), 350-51.

49. Cf. *HAL,* I, 40; cf. A. Jirku, "ʼAjjelet haš-Šaḫar (Ps 21,1)," *ZAW* 65 (1953) 85-86, with reference to archaeological evidence in Anatolia.

50. So B. D. Eerdmans, "On the Road to Monotheism," *Essays on Masoretic Psalms. OTS* 1 (1942) 117; idem, *The Hebrew Book of Psalms. OTS* 4 (1947) 173. See *HAL,* I, 40.

51. L. Delekat, "Probleme der Psalmenüberschriften," *ZAW* 76 (1964) 296-97.

52. S. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien,* IV (Oslo, 1922), 26; cf. 26-29; more reserved in idem, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (2 vols.; New York, 1962), II, 214.

53. See A. Cooper, *RSP,* III, 420.

54. *IPN,* 169.

55. *KBL*², 962.

שָׁחַת *šāḥaṯ*

Contents: I. 1. Occurrences and Etymology. 2. LXX. II. Verb: 1. Basic Considerations; 2. Piel and Hiphil: a. Human Beings as Subjects; b. Yahweh as Subject; 3. Niphal and Hophal. III. Substantival Derivatives. IV. Qumran.

I. 1. *Occurrences and Etymology.* The word group *šḥt* is attested 165 times in Hebrew; the verb occurs by far the most frequently, including 95 times in the hiphil (though in Dnl. 8:24a in a corrupt text; cf. *BHS*), 39 in the piel, 6 in the niphal, 2 in the hophal (only the ptcp.; Mal. 1:14 cited in 5Q10 1, 1 with the pual ptcp.). Derivations similarly include primarily substantival verbal forms, including the hiphil ptcp. *mašḥîṯ* 20 times, the hophal ptcp. *mošḥāṯ* once, then **mašḥēṯ* and *mišḥaṯ* only once each.[1] The subst. ptcp. *šᵉḥîṯâ* occurs 3 times in Biblical Aramaic, the same form also once in Sirach (Aramaism). The verb also occurs 9 times in the hiphil and once in the hophal in Sirach.

Although the root occurs about 20 times in the Hebrew and twice in the Aramaic Qumran writings, the conditions of the texts do not always allow a reliable interpretation. Later Middle Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic attest only sparse occurrences; here the word group has largely been replaced by *ḥbl.*[2] It is otherwise attested in most of the other West and South Semitic languages, including Phoenician, Yaudi, Egyptian Aramaic, and Syriac (also attested here with partial assimilation, *šḥṭ,* the latter perhaps also in Old Aramaic).[3] The occurrences are uncertain in Ugaritic as well as in one Ammonite inscription (more likely a correspondence with *šaḥaṯ*).[4] The Arabic equivalent is *saḥata,* "destroy, extirpate," the OSA equivalent *sḥt,* "destroy."[5] In Ethiopic it is difficult to determine whether equivalents derive from *šḥt* or *šḥṭ.*[6] East Semitic attests no corresponding term.

The basic meaning of the root cannot be precisely determined. Although the general meaning seems to be "destroy, ruin," West Semitic attests this meaning only for derived

---

šāḥaṯ. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography XI," *Bibl* 54 (1973) 351-66, esp. 355-56; G. Harder, "φθείρω κτλ.," *TDNT,* IX, 93-106; M. T. Houtsma, "Textkritisches," *ZAW* 27 (1907) 57-59; O. Keel, "Erwägungen zum Sitz im Leben des vormosaischen Pascha und zur Etymologie von פֶּסַח," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 414-34; R. E. Murphy, "*Šaḥat* in the Qumran Literature," *Bibl* 39 (1958) 61-66; D. Vetter, "שחת *šḥt* pi./hi. to ruin," *TLOT,* III, 1317-19; L. Wächter, "Reste von Šafʿel-Bildungen im Hebräischen," *ZAW* 83 (1971) 380-89, esp. 384-85.

1. See III.2 below.
2. Jastrow, 851, 1548, 1552. → חבל *ḥāḇal (chābhal)* III (IV, 185-88); cf. Harder, 99.
3. See *DNSI,* II, 1122-23; *LexSyr,* 771-72, 768; *KAI* 222A.32.
4. See *UT,* no. 2400; M. Baldacci, "The Ammonite Text from Tell Siran and North-West Semitic Philology," *VT* 31 (1981) 364-67; *HAL,* IV, 1470a.
5. On Arabic see Lane, I/4, 1314; on OSA, Conti-Rossini, 194; cf. W. W. Müller, "Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum Hebräischen Lexikon," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 315; Beeston, 125.
6. *HAL,* IV, 1458-59, 1469-70.

plains why neither imperfects nor participles occur with the piel, while both occur with the hiphil, with the former occurring far more frequently.

The infinitive construct with *l*ᵉ occurs with striking and almost equally distributed frequency in connection with both conjugation stems, generally (about 30 times) after verbs of movement or volition (the latter only with the hiphil) to refer to a mode of action or attitude focused or intent on radical destruction. The piel again presupposes that such destruction does indeed come about, whereas the hiphil focuses on the intention to bring it about;[12] a commensurate situation applies to constructions using the negations *l*ᵉ*ḇiltî* or *min.*

The most frequent subjects of the verb or of the verb governing the infinitive construct are human beings, less frequently God, though in one series of passages human beings act at God's behest such that the latter represents the actual initiator of the action. Other entities and powers appear as subjects commissioned by God in isolated instances. Those affected are always human beings, either as direct objects or as the main bearers of suffering and thus as the primary target of such acts. One should also note that the destruction of concrete objects is adduced almost exclusively as comparisons for the fate of human beings and that the corresponding passages are to be understood from this perspective.

The negated jussive of the hiphil in Ps. 57:1(Eng. S); 58:1(S); 59:1(S); 75:1(S) is probably a technical musical term that probably cannot be interpreted reliably.[13]

The niphal and hophal express the result of destructive activities or, in a more general sense, a state of corruption.

2. *Piel and Hiphil.* a. *Human Beings as Subjects.* The point of departure for the piel and hiphil of the verb are those passages in which human beings function as subjects who are responsible for their actions.

(1) *War and Power Politics.* Destructive and extirpative action occurs above all in war, and the verb is associated with this theme with particular frequency. One adversary advances ruthlessly against the other with the goal of completely overcoming and beating him, of annihilating him as an independent entity, something presupposing that the former possesses the superior power to which the latter of necessity falls victim or is at least powerful and dangerous enough seriously to threaten the latter's existence. The most important passages here initially are those in which Israel represents the superior party or which focus on inner-Israelite conflicts. Joab goes out to subject the Ammonites to David and to pay them back once and for all for their hostility (2 S. 11:1; cf. 10:1-14). In the parallel passage in Chronicles, their land is the object of the verb (1 Ch. 20:1); the land itself will be decimated by a devastating military campaign resulting in such serious loss of life that they will cease to exist as an independent people and political entity. In Josh. 22:23 such devastation is directed at the land of two Israelite tribes as part of internal Israelite chastisement for constructing illegitimate altars (cf. vv. 10ff.).

---

12. *HP,* 261-62.

13. Survey of the interpretive attempts in *HAL,* IV, 1471-72.

killing of these two people constitutes an extremely grievous transgression. In the case of Saul it is also a sacrilege, since Saul, as the anointed of Yahweh, possesses special dignity.[25]

This context also includes Sir. 8:16, which warns against underhanded murder by a hot-tempered person, and Jer. 2:30b, which compares the killing of prophets in Israel to destruction by a ravenous lion. According to Gen. 38:9, when Onan spills his seed uselessly on the ground instead of begetting a son, thus avoiding his levirate obligation, he is in fact extinguishing another person, namely, his deceased brother, since now that brother cannot live on in his descendants (cf. vv. 8,10;[26] the same issue in 2 S. 14:11; see below).

Ex. 21:26 addresses the mistreatment of a slave whose eye is destroyed, i.e., a case of severe bodily harm for which compensation must be provided. Lev. 19:27 prohibits men from marring the edges of their beards. Use of *šḥt* in this context (cf. by contrast *glḥ* piel in Lev. 21:5) perhaps expresses the understanding that such an illegitimate rite violates the integrity of the body.[27]

The remaining passages do not reflect situations involving immediate and direct destruction, but rather situations involving destructive actions or behavior leading to the damage of the affected object and ultimately to its complete destruction. People are almost exclusively the subjects of such actions in wisdom texts. "An undisciplined king ruins his people [city]" (Sir. 10:3; the same applies retrospectively to the Babylonian king as a result of his power politics, Isa. 14:20). The hypocrite[28] destroys the personal life of others by besmirching their reputations (Prov. 11:9); the same applies to an enemy to whom secrets are entrusted (Sir. 12:11; cf. v. 10). The consequences of the adulterer's actions ruin his own life (*nepeš,* Prov. 6:32; cf. 29-31,33-35; cf. also Sir. 9:8, here probably hophal pf., "be ruined"); the same applies to those who under the control of evil passion (*nepeš,* here the subj., Sir. 6:4; 19:3).

Two passages involve concrete objects. By neglecting the temple edifice, the kings of Judah for all practical purposes let it go to ruin (2 Ch. 34:11). By contrast, the redeemer *(gō'ēl)* in Ruth 4:6 acts out of self-interest when he withdraws from marriage with Ruth in order to prevent (future) damage to his inheritance *(naḥ^{a}lâ),* though he does exaggerate in saying that he would be destroying his inheritance and thus be acting irresponsibly.[29]

Abstractions can also be objects (on *nepeš* in Prov. 6:32, see above). The priests have caused many to stumble by their instruction[30] and thereby corrupted the covenant of Levi (Mal. 2:8). The king of Tyre corrupted his wisdom through pride (Ezk. 28:17). In pursuing his brother (Judah) with the sword, Edom suppressed the pity *(raḥ^{a}mîm)*

---

25. → משׁח *māšaḥ,* IX, 49-51.
26. → זרע *zāra',* IV, 143-62.
27. Though cf. also → גלח *gillaḥ (gillach),* III, 14-17.
28. → חנף *ḥānēp,* V, 36-44.
29. On the attendant legal problems, cf. comms., esp. W. Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth; Das Hohelied; Die Klagelieder. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 60-65, 67.
30. → תורה *tôrâ.*

and its kingdom were not immediately destroyed (2 Ch. 12:7,12, *kn'*[51]). By contrast, Josiah is killed because he ignored the divine warning that might have saved him (2 Ch. 35:21; cf. v. 22). Similarly Israel will no longer experience such destruction after returning to Yahweh once and for all (Dt. 4:31; cf. → שׁוּב *šûḇ* in v. 30)

Mal. 3:11 can also be discussed in this context. Here the appropriate tithe will allegedly prompt Yahweh to prevent the "devourer" (locusts) from destroying the fruit of the field. According to Isa. 65:8, Yahweh will preserve only the better part of Israel, i.e., the part that has remained faithful to him (cf. vv. 11-15), and thus not destroy all of Israel; here the comparison is with a vine that because of a few good grapes will not be entirely discarded. By contrast, Sodom as a whole will escape destruction if only a few righteous persons can be found in it so that such persons will not die with the wicked (Gen. 18:28,31-32; cf. v. 23).

According to Dt. 9:26; 10:10; and Ps. 106:23, one factor prompting Yahweh not to destroy Israel in the wilderness was Moses' intercession (in Dt. 9:25-26 and Ps. 106:23 *šḥt* is probably an intensification of the preceding statement).[52] Ps. 106:23 refers metaphorically to someone standing in a breach in the city wall (*pereṣ*[53]). Because Ezk. 22:30 uses the same expression, the reference is probably similar first of all to the intercession that could have thwarted Israel's later catastrophe, though the more likely comparison with Ezk. 13:5 does prompt the conclusion that the real task was to bring Israel to proper understanding, thereby prompting its conversion and thwarting the catastrophe.

References to unconditional future preservation from destruction are found only in Hos. 11:9 with regard to Israel and in the announcement in Gen. 9:11,15 that no flood will ever again destroy the earth and all that lives in it (cf. Sir. 44:18).

3. *Niphal and Hophal.* The niphal of the verb describes the condition brought about by such destructive actions, the cause of such action being in all but one instance human beings. It is the sinful behavior of humankind in general that brings destruction upon the entire earth (Gen. 6:11,12a; cf. v. 12b), just as it is the Israelites' own fault that their deeds (*ᵃlîlôṯ*) are perverted (Ezk. 20:44).[54] Similarly in Jer. 13:7 and 18:4 it is human beings who, consciously or not, cause certain objects to become unusable (illustrating in 18:4 Israel's degeneracy, which displeased Yahweh, and in 13:7 the imminent ruin of Israel; on 13:7 cf. v. 9[55]). Only the devastation of Egypt in Ex. 8:20(24) is the result of an insect plague Yahweh himself imposes upon the country (v. 20b, emended text; cf. *BHS*[56]).

In contrast to the niphal, the hophal (ptcp.) serves only to establish the ruined condi-

---

51. → כנע *kn'* (II.2), VII, 207-9.

52. → שׁמד *šmd* hiphil.

53. → פרץ *pāraṣ* (II.2), XII, 109-10.

54. In this regard, as well as on Zeph. 3:7, see II.2.a.(2) above.

55. See in this regard II.2.b above; also D. Bourguet, "La métaphore de la ceinture: Jérémie 13/1-11," *ETR* 62 (1987) 165-84.

56. On *'ārōḇ* see *HAL*, II, 879.

tion of a specific entity in the sense that it now cannot be used in its normal way (sacrificial animal, Mal. 1:14;[57] fountain, Prov. 25:26), though these passages also illustrate human transgression over against Yahweh by adducing a single symptom or by employing a metaphor.[58]

III. Substantival Derivatives.

1. *mašḥîṯ*. The substantival hiphil participle refers first of all, commensurate with the use of the verb, to specific personal entities as being particularly ruinous and mercilessly destructive. In 1 S. 13:17 and 14:15, it is a Philistine military formation that apparently has the specific task of devastating Israelite territory. Here *mašḥîṯ* may even be a technical term for such a formation.[59] Jer. 22:7 may refer to several such formations. The reference is in any event to a superior power that at Yahweh's behest will utterly destroy Jerusalem as the seat of the king. Other passages similarly refer to a military opponent who as Yahweh's emissary will fall upon Israel and other nations with overwhelming power and who as such exhibits almost superhuman features (Israel as the object in Jer. 4:7 [by contrast, focus of the preservation of Israel in Isa. 54:16; cf. vv. 15,17]; other nations in Jer. 51:1, here using the expression *rûaḥ mašḥîṯ,* and Ezk. 21:36[31], with *ḥārāšê mašḥîṯ,* probably formulated after the model of Isa. 54:16[60]). By referring to the threatening demonic figure of the "destroyer" as *mašḥîṯ,* Ex. 12:23 thus characterizes it similarly as the embodiment of superhuman destructive power.[61]

The *mal'āḵ* plays a comparable role in 2 S. 24:16 and 1 Ch. 21:15, where *mašḥîṯ* is, however, used verbally.[62] The notion of such a demonic power may also be behind the *ba'al* or *'îš mašḥîṯ* mentioned in Prov. 18:9; 28:24. Those who are slack in work or who rob (*gāzal*[63]) their parents are then comparable to a ruinous demon or to a person who employs such a demon (on *ba'al* in the latter sense, cf. *ba'ᵃlaṯ-'ôḇ* in 1 S. 28:7). The question must remain open whether *mašḥîṯ* here is indeed to be understood personally or, as in the following passages, more as an abstraction.[64]

In the remaining passages, *mašḥîṯ* takes on the abstract meaning "(complete) destruction, ruin." It is construed most frequently with *lᵉ* to express that the action aims at or ultimately ends with the definitive destruction of the object; applied to Israel, it refers to Yahweh's own future actions (Ezk. 5:16aα, through deadly arrows of famine; cf. the piel in v. 16aβ; also 9:6,8[65]) and the ongoing hostility of the Philistines (Ezk. 25:15). The same applies to the conflict — caused by Yahweh — between two of Israel's enemies (2 Ch. 20:23, *'āzᵉrû,* probably a corrupt text; see *BHS;* cf. v. 22) as well

---

57. Concerning 5Q10 1, 1 see I.1 above.
58. On the hophal perfect in Sir. 9:8, see II.2.a.(2) above.
59. See Houtsma, 59.
60. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 450.
61. → פסח *pāsaḥ* (II.1), XII, 9-14; Keel, 421-27, 431-33.
62. See II.2.b above.
63. → גזל *gāzal* (III), II, 457-58.
64. For detailed discussion see Keel, 425-26.
65. Concerning this and 5:16aβ, see II.2.b above.

as to the sinful behavior of an individual (2 Ch. 22:4), whereas the Passover rite prevents ruinous disaster from coming upon Israel (Ex. 12:13; cf. v. 23; see the discussion above).

Because of Babylon's attacks on Zion, Jer. 51:25 characterizes and condemns it as *har hammašḥîṯ* (cf. v. 24; according to v. 25aβ also because of its destructive actions against the entire world, i.e., including other nations,[66] albeit the latter quite at the behest of Yahweh [v. 20],[67] which is why v. 25aβ is probably to be viewed as an addendum[68]). Because of the ruinous effects of the foreign cults practiced on the Mount of Olives, 2 K. 23:13 also refers to it as *har-hammašḥîṯ*.[69] In Jer. 5:26 *mašḥîṯ* refers metaphorically to the traps of bird hunters and was doubtless chosen to evoke the hopeless situation into which the wealthy bring the poor (cf. vv. 27-28). When Dnl. 10:8 says that Daniel's complexion grew deathly pale, it means that he lost all composure and traces of human dignity.[70]

2. *Remaining Derivations.* The remaining substantival derivations generally mean "destruction, ruin." In Ezk. 9:1b the term **mašḥēṯ* together with *kᵉlî* ("destroying weapon") refers to the catastrophe recounted in what follows (cf. *mašḥîṯ* in 9:6[71]). The substantival hophal participle (Lev. 22:25) characterizes the castration of an animal as ruinous damage rendering the animal unsuitable for sacrifice (cf. Mal. 1:14).[72] Isa. 52:14 uses *mišḥaṯ* to refer to the total physical marring of the Servant of Yahweh (though the text may be corrupt[73]).

In Biblical Aramaic this word group is attested only by the substantival feminine form of the peal participle, which refers to "depravity" in the ethical sense, i.e., to evil, wicked behavior or speech (in Dnl. 6:5bα as grounds for accusation, in v. 5bβ par. *šālû,* "neglect" [v. 5bβ probably representing an addendum; cf. *BHS*], in 2:9 par. *kiḏbâ,* "lying" [used in apposition to *millâ,* not as an adjective[74]]). The same form occurs in the plural in Sir. 30:11 (Aramaism) in reference to the bad behavior of the son one is trying to educate (cf. vv. 1-10,12-13).[75]

IV. Qumran. In the Hebrew Qumran texts the hiphil of the verb refers to the antidivine, destructive actions of the Kittim (1QpHab 4:13) and of the enemies of the community in general, actions also personally threatening individual members of the community (1QH 2:27; cf. ll. 25-26). The same applies to *mašḥîṯ* in reference to such hostile powers (pl. in 1QH 3:38; sg. in 4Q511 1:6; in apposition to → שׂטן *śāṭān* in 1QH

66. See II.2.a.(1) above.
67. See in this regard II.2.b above.
68. See W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 309-11.
69. Not to be emended with *BHS;* cf. *HAL,* II, 644b.
70. → הוד *hôḏ (hôdh)* (II.4), III, 355.
71. See in this regard III.1 above; on v. 1b as an addendum, cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 222-23.
72. See in this regard II.3 above.
73. Cf. *BHS; HAL,* II, 644.
74. But cf. *KBL*¹, 1084, 1129.
75. On *šaḥaṯ,* "ruin," in Sirach, see IV below.

reference now more likely being to the vb. *šḥt,* something perhaps elsewhere the case as well, for example, as suggested by the customary LXX translation of *šaḥaṯ* as *diaphthorá.*

Wächter

שטף *šṭp*

Contents: I. Occurrences and Etymology. II. The Verb *šṭp:* 1. Cleansing; 2. Rescue; 3. Danger and Destruction. III. The Noun *šeṭep.* IV. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX.

I. Occurrences and Etymology. The root *šṭp* is a fientic root occurring 31 times in the OT as a verb and 6 times as a noun. The notion of flowing water regularly comes to expression. The semantic scope includes water rinsing off, washing over, and washing away, and as such to water that flows, overflows, or sweeps away in contexts involving situations that can preserve, threaten, or even destroy life. The same applies to Aramaic and Modern Hebrew witnesses.[1] The Arabic term *šaṭafa,* "rinse (out), wash," is restricted to the cleansing function of water.[2] A more comprehensive understanding is found in Egyptian texts in which *śṭf* can refer to the pouring out of liquid in preparing medications or of water in general (for watering the land).[3] From the period of the Middle Kingdom, *ṯṯf* refers to the pouring out of liquids, including water that pours out onto the land and possibly even floods it.[4]

Unfortunately the meaning of subst. *šṭp* in one Ugaritic text is unclear,[5] but there does not seem to be any connection with Heb. *šṭp.* A homonymous relationship is probably also present with the Akkadian vb. *šaṭāpu(m),* which with a divine subject means "preserve, rescue life."[6] Otherwise one would have to reckon with extreme polysemy

---

šṭp. J. Barth, "שׁוֹט שֹׁטֵף," *ZAW* 33 (1913) 306-7; idem, "Miscellen 1. Zu שׁוֹט 'Flut,'" *ZAW* 34 (1914) 69; J. Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea. UCOP* 35 (1985); H. Gese, "Die strömende Geissel des Hadad und Jesaja 28,15 und 18," *Archäologie und AT. FS K. Galling* (Tübingen, 1970), 127-34; H. Klein, "Das Klima Palästinas auf Grund der alten hebräischen Quellen," *ZDPV* 37 (1914) 217-49, 297-327; R. Liwak, "Die altorientalischen Grossmächte in der Metaphorik der Prophetie," *Prophetie und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel. FS S. Herrmann* (Stuttgart, 1991), 206-30; H. G. May, "Some Cosmic Connotations of *mayim rabbîm,* 'Many Waters,'" *JBL* 74 (1955) 9-21; S. Poznański, "Miscellen 6. Zu שׁוֹט שֹׁטֵף," *ZAW* 36 (1916) 119-20; P. Reymond, *L'eau, sa vie, et sa signification dans l'AT. SVT* 6 (1958).

1. *WTM,* IV, 542-43; Jastrow, 1554-55.
2. Wehr, 471.
3. *WbÄS,* IV, 342, with a reference to Copt. *sotf.*
4. *WbÄS,* V, 411-12.
5. *KTU* 4.150, 1; cf. *WUS,* no. 2599 with *UT,* no. 2406.
6. *AHw,* III, 1203.

(antithetical meaning), though that is certainly conceivable in that Heb. *šṭp* can refer to both positive and negative power.

It is possible to establish an etymological connection among *šṭp, šṣp,* and *ṣûp̱* (qal, "flood"; niphal "make float"; cf. Aram. *ṭûp*), if one assumes a consonant switch,[7] thus construing *šeṭep* and *šeṣep* parallel (Isa. 54:8) and assuming a biconsonantal basis *(šp/ṣp).* In any event, the dominant semantic notion, expressed by a *p* at the end of a Hebrew root, is that of loss or diminution frequently realized in combination with *š* in initial and *p* in third position (alongside *šṭp,* e.g., *š'p* II, *šdp, šḥp, šsp, šṣp*), though also with *ṭ* as the second and *p* as the third consonant (e.g., *ḥṭp, 'ṭp*).[8]

Expressions with *šṭp* include *šôṭēp̱ ṣᵉḏāqâ* (Isa. 10:22); *gešem šôṭēp̱* (Ezk. 13:11,13; 38:22); *naḥal šôṭēp̱* (2 Ch. 32:4; Isa. 30:28; 66:12; Jer. 47:2); *sûs šôṭēp̱* (Jer. 8:6); *šôṭ šôṭēp̱* (Isa. 28:15,18).

II. The Verb *šṭp.*

1. *Cleansing.* Because holiness could be transferred through contact, when the priest prepared meat for the sin offering[9] he had to cleanse not only the blood-spattered garment but also the vessel that prior to the cultic act itself had already come into contact with "aspersed" blood. If the vessel was earthen, it was to be broken; if bronze, it had to be scoured and rinsed with water insofar as it was considered valuable (Lev. 6:21[Eng. 28]). The result of contact with impurity was comparable to incorrectly executed sacralization. Here too the earthen vessel was to be broken while a precious wooden vessel had to be rinsed with water, apparently because wood itself was scarce (15:12). The transference of impurity from someone with a discharge could be avoided only if such persons washed their hands with water prior to contact with others (15:11).

The lack of distinction between strictly hygienic and ritual cleansing[10] after contamination evident in Lev. 15:12 probably also applies to Ezk. 16:9. In an historical retrospective, Yahweh's concern for Jerusalem as a maturing woman comes to expression in that he bathes her with water, anoints her with oil, and washes off the (purificatory) blood from her.[11]

In 1 K. 22:38 blood is similarly washed away with water when the chariot of the king of Israel, who fell in battle with the Arameans, is cleansed in the "pool of Samaria."[12] This washing semiritually cleanses the king's reputation, quite in contrast to the prostitutes who wash themselves in the unclean water.

---

7. See C. J. Labuschagne, "Original Shaph'el-Forms in Biblical Hebrew," *OTWSA* 10 (1971) 54; *GK,* §19a.

8. See K. Koskinen, "Kompatibilität in den dreikonsonantischen hebräischen Wurzeln," *ZDMG* 114 (1964) 51 n. 4.

9. → חטא *ḥāṭā' (chāṭā'),* IV, 309-19.

10. → טהר *ṭāhar,* V, 287-96; → מים *mayim,* VIII, 265-88.

11. See W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 340.

12. See in this regard H. Weippert, *Palästina in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Munich, 1988), 539.

Reflections in ancient Jewish legal texts underscoring the significance of the water from wadis for purification in case of water scarcity show that the understanding of such washings must not categorically be isolated from the phenomenon of flowing water, which is often associated with *šṭp.*[13]

2. *Rescue.* The postexilic texts 2 Ch. 32:4 and Ps. 78:20 allude to historical situations. After Ps. 78:12-13 recounts the miracle of the Red Sea, vv. 14ff. go beyond Ex. 17:6 regarding the wilderness period in mentioning how God provides water for the people (*tᵉhōmôṯ,* v. 15), with *nᵉḥālîm* gushing out from the rock (v. 20, *zûḇ* par. *šṭp*). This passage probably also evokes the notion of wadis filling with water during the rainy season[14] (cf. → נהר *nāhār* in v. 16; cf. also 2 K. 3:20; Joel 4:18[3:18]).

2 Ch. 32:4 makes a peculiar reference with regard to the term *naḥal.* As one of the military preparations during the time of Hezekiah, the people stopped all the springs and "the wadi that flowed through the land" *(hannaḥal haššôṭēp bᵉṯôḵ-hā'āreṣ),* possibly a reference to the Shiloah tunnel or a canal predating it.[15]

The retrospective in Ps. 124 describes those who would have swallowed up the psalmist alive had Yahweh not kept them away (vv. 2-3; cf. Ps. 79:7; Isa. 9:11[10]; Jer. 51:34). Mention is then made in vv. 4-5 to the flood that would have swept life *(nepeš)* away *(mayim šᵉṭāpûnû,* par. *naḥlâ 'āḇar* and *hammayim hazzêḏônîm).* Although *naḥlâ* suggests a wadi that becomes a death trap after suddenly being filled by heavy rainfall,[16] here the notion — as shown by the personification of danger[17] — has a mythological reference, particularly since Yahweh appears as the master of the waters of chaos and since even the waters of the underworld can be understood as a river (*nāhār,* Jon. 2:3-4[2-3]) or wadi (*naḥal,* Ps. 18:5[4]).[18] In any event, these verses metaphorically describe preservation from mortal danger.

The same applies to the oracle of salvation in Isa. 43:1-7. The new exodus of exiles is secured (v. 2) in that Yahweh protects his people from the overwhelming waters when they cross rivers *(nᵉhārôṯ).*[19] This passage situationally combines the story of the miracle of the Reed Sea during the exodus from Egypt (Ex. 14) with the "rivers" familiar in Babylonia.

Cant. 8:6-7 uses metaphor and comparison to express with penetrating forcefulness the insuperable nature of love and passion, maintaining that both are as unassailable as death and the underworld. Not even the "many waters" *(mayim rabbîm)* can overcome love, nor can floods *(nᵉhārôṯ)* sweep it away *(šṭp).* This passage, too, evokes a mythical

---

13. Mish. *Miqw.* 5:6; *'Ed.* 5:2; Tos. *'Ed.* 4:10. See *AuS,* I/1 (1928), 211.

14. → נחל *naḥal,* IX, 335-40.

15. For the former see P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern. WMANT* 42 (1973), 30 n. 90; for the latter, J. Becker, *2 Chronik. NEB* 20 (1988), 106.

16. See K.-H. Bernhardt, *Das Problem der altorientalischen Königsideologie im AT. SVT* 8 (1961), 278-79 n. 4.

17. On *ym* and *nhr* as deities in the myth of Ba'al, see *KTU* 1.1-6.

18. See May, 17.

19. See Gilg. X ii 25 et passim.

dimension rather than merely illustrating a sapiential maxim that compares love to a fire that cannot be extinguished by water.[20]

As in 2 Ch. 32:4, in Isa. 66:12 *naḥal šôṭēp* is not a harmful phenomenon (cf. by contrast Isa. 30:28; Jer. 47:2). In this Trito-Isaianic oracle (66:7-14), Yahweh gives Jerusalem prosperity *(šālôm)* like a river (*kᵉnāhār;* cf. 48:18) and the wealth *(kāḇôḏ)* of the nations "like an overflowing stream."

3. *Danger and Destruction.* Most occurrences involve situations of danger and destruction and can basically be divided into those involving an individual and those involving a collective.

a. The cloudbursts common in Israel that can wash away and erode the fertile soil and thus even cause houses to collapse[21] constitute the background to Job 14:19. The destruction of wall foundations and the washing away *(šṭp)* of the soil of the fields *(ʿᵃpar-ʾāreṣ)* by heavy rainfall[22] also "destroy the hope of mortals."

Ezk. 13:11,13; and 38:22 also mention this destructive rainfall, referring to it as *gešem šôṭēp.* Together with stormy winds and hailstones, it exposes the false sense of stability brought about by false prophets and prophetesses. The downpours and hailstones of Ezk. 13 are part of an unsystematic series including pestilence, bloodshed, fire (cf. Isa. 43:2 and Ex. 9:18,23; Ps. 11:6; 105:32; Isa. 30:30), and sulfur that God will pour down upon the eschatological enemy from the north, Gog, his army, and his allies (Ezk. 38:22).

Ps. 69 transcends the notion of actual distress involving water in that the petitioner variously addresses this danger metaphorically (cf. Ps. 32:6; 124:4-5; Nah. 1:8). According to v. 3(2), he has sunk in mire and deep waters, and the flood sweeps over him *(šibbōleṯ šᵉṭāpāṯnî).*[23] As in v. 3(2),[24] the entreaty in v. 16(15), referring to a well that can be associated with mire in v. 3(2), refers to experiences with pits as prisons (cf. Ps. 40:3[2]; 88:7-8[6-7]; Lam. 3:53-54), though the notion of a devouring deep (*mᵉṣûlâ* with *blʿ*) does suggest an association with the underworld (*šᵉʾôl* alongside *mᵉṣûlâ* in Ps. 88:4-8[3-7]; Jon. 2:3-4[2-3]; cf. by contrast Ps. 107:24), which might be understood as a devouring entity (Isa. 5:14). This metaphor succeeds in verbalizing a worldview that transcends the concrete world around us while not simply suspending the tension between experience and reality.

b. All remaining passages using *šṭp* in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel are directed against Israel or another people. That all are intended metaphorically does not mean that they merely employ "figurative," ornamental expressions that by way of analogy are intended to evoke through imagery what is in fact abstract. Like metaphors in general, those constructed with *šṭp* show that prophetic language is not merely "mimesis"

---

20. See May, 18. On the mythical dimension cf. H.-P. Müller, *Vergleich und Metapher im Hohenlied. OBO* 56 (1984), 32-33; O. Keel, *Song of Songs. CC* (Eng. trans. 1994), 276.

21. Cf. Klein, 242-43; *AuS,* I/1 (1928), 208.

22. Read *sᵉḥîpâ* instead of *sāpîᵃḥ* following *BHK* and *HAL,* II, 749b.

23. See *HAL,* IV, 1394.

24. See in this regard *SAHG,* 263-64, no. 13.

but also "poiesis" and does not categorically distinguish between myth and history, the purpose being better to comprehend "all" of reality.[25]

In Isa. 8:5-8, which historicizes the idea of the waters of chaos,[26] the gently flowing waters of Shiloah are juxtaposed with the mighty waters of the "River" that will overflow its banks and "sweep on into Judah as a flood," sweeping it away (*wᵉḥālap bîhûdâ šāṭōp wᵉʿāḇōr* instead of *šāṭap wᵉʿāḇar*[27]). Metaphorical use is made here of the floods that come during the main rainy season and that in certain terrain prevent escape and might even serve tactical military purposes (cf. Jgs. 5:19-21). This flood will now in a sense happen for all of Judah.

This notion corresponds to the self-understanding of the Assyrian kings themselves, who viewed themselves and their weapons as overwhelming floodwaters.[28] In Isa. 8:7, however, reference to the "king of Assyria and all his glory" may represent a later insertion anticipating modern transferals into a more "concrete" setting.[29] The "river" in Isaiah probably focuses on the power of such floods whose understanding is not really fully exhausted in the empirical phenomenon, just as Assyrian texts refer metaphorically to such ravaging floods as *abūbu(m)* or *abūbiš/abūbāniš*. This flood also exhibits cosmic dimensions in that it is associated not only with the king but also with gods and mythical monsters.[30]

Within the post-Isaianic unit Isa. 30:27-33,[31] v. 28 may have been influenced by 8:8. Here Yahweh's breath *(rûaḥ)* is like an overflowing stream *(kᵉnaḥal šôṭēp)* that "reaches up to the neck" of the nations.

In only one passage is the subject of *šṭp* an abstract noun. In the oracle Isa. 10:20-23, dating at the earliest to the Persian period,[32] the author reflects on a "remnant of Israel" and views the destruction of the others *(killāyôn ḥārûṣ)* as justified, *šôṭēp ṣᵉḏāqâ* (cf. Am. 5:24).

Isa. 28 uses the vb. *šṭp* repeatedly. In the oracle against Samaria (vv. 1-6, or 1-4), v. 2 compares "the one who is mighty and strong" to a "storm of hail" *(kᵉzerem bārāḏ)*, a "destroying tempest" *(śaʿar qāṭeḇ)*, and a "storm of mighty, overflowing waters" *(kᵉzerem mayim kabbîrîm šōṭᵉpîm)*. In the force of their statements, these comparisons gradually deviate from the metaphors and thus recall in only a limited fashion 8:7; 28:15,17,18 (cf. 17:12-13, though also 30:30). Because metaphorical speech can conceal and reveal at the same time, an identification of the oppressor is difficult and problematic.[33]

According to Isa. 28:14-22, the inhabitants of Jerusalem believe that because they

25. See Liwak, 219.
26. See Day, 126.
27. So J. Huesman, "Finite Uses of the Infinitive Absolute," *Bibl* 37 (1956) 287.
28. See P. Machinist, "Assyria and Its Image in the First Isaiah," *JAOS* 103 (1983) 726ff.
29. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 341.
30. Documentation in *AHw*, I, 8; *CAD*, I/1, 76-81.
31. See O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 305-10.
32. See Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12*, 436; Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1983), 240-42.
33. See Liwak, 212, 214-15.

have made a covenant with death and the underworld (both anarthrous in Hebrew), they will be protected from coming danger. The obscure form *šyṭ šwṭp* in v. 15 is to be read as *šôṭ šôṭēp̄* with *Q,* 1QIsa^a^, and v. 18 (cf. also 1QH 6:35). The *K* is apparently thinking of *šayiṭ,* "oar," whereas the LXX has *kataigís,* "storm," and Pesh. *šwwṭ' dgrwpy',* "spread of the flood." Barth believes (and is supported by Poznański with rabbinic witnesses) that *šôṭ* represents a lexeme with the meaning "flood" that alongside *šôṭ,* "whip," requires an independent lexical entry.[34] By contrast, Gese adduces iconographical and inscriptional evidence from the ancient Near East depicting the weather god with a whip calling forth rainstorms and causing mountains and oceans to convulse chaotically; Gese then interprets the term as a "scourge streaming with pouring rain and floods of water."[35] Isa. 28:17b (cf. v. 15 LXX) suggests a storm situation. One might also note that the Talmud refers to destructive rain as a scourge (*šēḇeṭ,* Bab. *Ta'an.* 8b).

The predicted disaster acquires concrete form in that the "overwhelming scourge" ceaselessly sweeps (or "takes," *lqḥ*) people along with it (Isa. 28:19). Nor does the use of *'br* as a verb of action militate against this understanding, since such metaphors cannot be reduced to "compatible images," as also shown by v. 18, which describes the result of the *šôṭ šôṭēp̄* as a land that is beaten down rather than swept away *(mirmās).*

Finally, Jer. 8:6 also attests what for the modern sensibility is somewhat incongruous imagery. The people run astray (vv. 4-7) "like a horse plunging headlong into battle" *(k^e^sûs šôṭēp̄ bammilḥāmâ).* Its apostasy *(šûḇ)* from God cannot be fast or destructive enough.

The military connotations of *šṭp* in Isaiah predominate in the book of Daniel. The verb occurs 4 times in ch. 11, which recounts the history of the end time. In v. 10, which alludes to Seleucus III and Antiochus III, the author recounts that (presumably) the army of Antiochus III, which in 219 B.C.E. campaigned through Phoenicia and Palestine as far as Gaza, advances *(bô'),* overwhelms *(šṭp),* and passes through (*'br;* cf. Isa. 28:15,18). By contrast, Dnl. 11:22, apparently with a contemporary reference but without any allusion to historical events, relates to Antiochus IV: "Armies, (mighty) as a storm flood, shall be utterly swept away and broken before him" *(ûz^e^rō'ôṯ haššeṭep yiššāṭ^e^pû mill^e^pānāyw w^e^yiššāḇērû).* The translation of J.-C. Lebram is commensurate with the text.[36] The proposal in *BHS* to read *ûz^e^rō'ôṯ hiššāṭōp yiššāṭ^e^pû* destroys the substantive comparison, which is syntactically possible without the comparative particle,[37] thereby relativizing the rather audacious statement.

A comparable notion must be present in v. 26, which describes the defeat of the opposing army in the campaign of Antiochus IV against Egypt. Although the MT does read *yišṭôp* in connection with *ḥayil* (within ch. 11 only here in the sense of futile "flowing away"), many Hebrew mss. have *yšṭp,* which may point to a niphal form (cf. Pesh. *ntbdr* and Vg. *opprimere*).

Finally, v. 40 refers once more to the unrelenting advance of Antiochus IV; together

---

34. Cited in *HAL,* IV, 1441, with a question mark as *šôṭ* II, "outburst, sudden spate of water."
35. Gese, 132.
36. *Das Buch Daniel. ZBK* 23 (1984), 116.
37. See *GK,* §141d.

2. *OT Occurrences.* The root and its derivatives occur 27 times in the OT, including 25 times as a masculine qal participle and once each as a noun (Job 38:33) and personal name (1 Ch. 27:29). It is noteworthy that with the exception of Prov. 6:7, the participle occurs only in Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and 1/2 Chronicles, i.e., only in historical books, though one cannot discern any concentration in an individual source or redactional strata.

3. *Meaning.* Taking the basic meaning attested in Akkadian, "write," as the point of departure, a meaning also supported in Aramaic and other Semitic languages, one can similarly assume that the Hebrew root *šṭr* is first of all associated with the activity of writing. Nonetheless, referring to the *šōṭēr* simply as a "scribe" would be incorrect, since the OT already uses the word *sōp̄ēr* for "scribe, secretary," and indeed uses it alongside *šōṭēr* in 2 Ch. 26:11; 34:13. The word *šōṭēr* must rather be understood as the title of an official whose duties particularly required the ability to write and whose activities included the ability to evaluate written documents.[4] More specifically, the word *šōṭēr* in this sense is to be understood as the designation of a lower official or appointee whose tasks might include various spheres and thus vary in nature.

By contrast, the hapax legomenon *mišṭār* (Job 38:33) clearly evokes the basic meaning of the root and means "written document," specifically "heavenly writing," though here the expression (like Akk. *šiṭir/šiṭirtu šamê*, "heavenly writing") must be understood as a metaphorical circumscription for the stars as the heavenly legislators of what happens on earth.[5]

4. *LXX.* In its rendering of the masculine qal participle the LXX vacillates between several different words, the most frequent being *ho grammateús* (14 times). Only in 5 instances (all in Deuteronomy) does it use *ho grammato-eisagōgeús* and only in 2 *ho dikastḗs* and *ho kritḗs.*

II. Functionary. Occurrences of the root as the masculine qal participle are frequent alongside other Israelite groups representing dignitaries or officials. The *šōṭᵉrîm* often stand alongside the *zᵉqēnîm* (Nu. 11:16; Dt. 29:9[Eng. 10]; 31:28; Josh. 8:33; 23:2; 24:1), the *rā'šîm* (Dt. 1:15; 29:9[10]; Josh. 23:2; 24:1), the *šōp̄ᵉṭîm* (Dt. 16:18; Josh. 8:33; 23:2; 24:1; 1 Ch. 23:4; 26:29), and the *śārîm* (Dt. 1:15; 1 Ch. 27:1). Only in Ex. 5 do they appear in association with the *nōgᵉśîm* (Ex. 5:6,10).

1. *Ex. 5.* In the account of the imposition of a heavier workload for the Hebrews in Egypt (Ex. 5), the *šōṭᵉrîm* appear as lower supervisors chosen from among the people by the Egyptian *nōgᵉśîm;* they are subordinated to the *nōgᵉśîm* and receive orders from them that they are then to carry out. If they fail to do so, they are held personally ac-

---

4. See Macholz, 325 n. 23.

5. See *HAL,* II, 645a. Cf. G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1952), 90, 95; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 488, 508; van der Ploeg, 189. On the Akkadian see *AHw,* III, 1253.

countable. Their appointment by Egyptians, i.e., by foreigners (v. 14), suggests that the *šōṭ^erîm* in Ex. 5 did not occupy a concrete office during Israel's early period; this use probably represents rather an unhistorical projection of an Israelite office that was established only during a later epoch.[6]

2. *Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Chronicles.* In the traditions of Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua, the *šōṭēr* is a functionary commissioned by the people (Nu. 11:16; Dt. 16:18; 29:9[10]; 31:28; Josh. 1:10; 8:33 [cj.]; 24:1) or by the tribes of Israel and active on their behalf. In that capacity, he often appears alongside other officeholders in pre-state Israel, suggesting that the office of the *šōṭēr* was instituted during the pre-state period of Israel's history, specifically during the land conquest or the period of the judges.[7] Factors militating against its origin only during the monarchy,[8] a view derived from Chronicles, especially from the probably unhistorical account of a legal reform under Jehoshaphat in 2 Ch. 19, include the lack of any evidence of the office of *šōṭēr* in the lists of officials in Samuel and Kings or otherwise in Samuel, Kings, and the prophets. Chronicles apparently mentioned the pre-state office of the *šōṭēr* because it fit its own agenda of removing the differences between institutions associated with the state and the pre-state or tribal period.[9]

As officials commissioned by the people, the *šōṭ^erîm* exercise various duties among the tribes, appearing, for example, both in connection with military matters (Dt. 1:15; 20:5,8,9; Josh. 1:10; 3:2), as well as in the sphere of legal adjudication (Dt. 16:18) and general administration (Dt. 29:9[10]; 31:28; Josh. 8:33; 23:2; 24:1).[10] They always act, however, as secondary functionaries who receive and transmit orders.[11]

3. *Proverbs.* In the literary unit in Prov. 6:6-11, the industrious person is compared to the ant as a model for the lazy person to follow. The ant's behavior is characterized by its ability to provide for its own food even without guidance by a *šōṭēr.* Mention of the *šōṭēr* between the *qāṣîn* and the *mōšēl* in 6:7, however, raises doubts whether the postexilic author correctly understood the nature of the pre-state office of the *šōṭēr.*

III. The Nouns *mišṭār and šiṭray.* In the divine discourse in Job 38:1–40:2,6-14, the noun *mišṭār* describes in a summary fashion the influence the stars exert on events on earth by virtue of their inherent regularities (Job 38:33). In 1 Ch. 27:29 the derivative *šiṭray* (also a hapax legomenon) is the name of one of the stewards of the royal holdings of King David; he was responsible for "the herds that pastured in Sharon."

---

6. See in this regard W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6. BK* II/1 (1988), 249.
7. See II above. Cf. Rüterswörden, 110-11; W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus 1–6,* 249.
8. Cf. van der Ploeg, 195; Cazelles, 104.
9. Rüterswörden, 110.
10. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 87, is probably correct in maintaining that Nu. 11:16 contains a "secondary aside."
11. Van der Ploeg, 196.

M. L. Brenner, *The Song of the Sea: Ex 15:1-21. BZAW* 195 (1991); A. Büchler, "Zur Geschichte der Tempelmusik und der Tempelpsalmen," *ZAW* 19 (1899) 96-133, 329-44; 20 (1900) 97-135; R. J. Burns, *Has the Lord Indeed Spoken Only Through Moses? A Study of the Biblical Portrait of Miriam. SBLDS* 84 (1987); P. Casetti, "Funktionen der Musik in der Bibel," *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 24 (1977) 366-89; P. Cersoy, "L'Apologue de la Vigne au Chapitre Ve d'Isaïe (Versets 1-7)," *RB* 8 (1899) 40-49; F. Crüsemann, *Studien zur Formgeschichte von Hymnus und Danklied in Israel. WMANT* 32 (1969); K. P. Darr, "Like Warrior, like Woman: Destruction and Deliverance in Isaiah 42:10-17," *CBQ* 49 (1987) 560-71; L. Delekat, "Probleme der Psalmenüberschriften," *ZAW* 76 (1964) 280-97; O. Eissfeldt, "Die Umrahmung des Mose-Liedes Dtn 32,1-43 und des Mose-Gesetzes Dtn 1–30 in Dtn 31,9–32,47," *KlSchr,* III (1966), 322-34; J. Enciso, "Mizmor, shir y maśkil," *EstBíb* 12 (1953) 185-94; C. A. Evans, "On the Vineyard Parables of Isaiah 5 and Mark 12," *BZ* 28 (1984) 82-86; R. Ficker, "שִׁיר *šîr* to sing," *TLOT,* III, 1320-22; N. Füglister, *Die Verwendung und das Verständnis der Psalmen und des Psalters um die Zeitenwende. FzB* 60 (1988), 319-84; H. Gese, "Zur Geschichte der Kultsänger am Zweiten Tempel," *Abraham unser Vater. FS O. Michel* (Leiden, 1963), 222-34 = idem, *Vom Sinai zum Zion. BEvT* 64 ([3]1990), 147-58; A. Globe, "The Muster of the Tribes in Judges 5,11e-18," *ZAW* 87 (1975) 169-84; J. Gonda, "Ein neues Lied," *WZKM* 48 (1941) 275-90; A. Graffy, "The Literary Genre of Isaiah 5,1-7," *Bibl* 60 (1979) 400-409; H. Gross, "Lied," *BL,* 1056-57; A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester. FRLANT* 89 (1965); P. D. Hanson, "1 Chr 15–16 and the Chronicler's View on the Levites," *Sha'arei Talmon. FS S. Talmon* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1992), 69-77; M. R. Hauge, "On the Sacred Spot. The Concept of the Proper Localization Before God," *Scandinavian Journal for the OT* 4 (1990) 30-60; P. Höffken, "Probleme in Jesaja 5,1-7," *ZTK* 79 (1982) 392-410; A. Hurvitz, "The Term לִשְׁכוֹת שָׁרִים (Ezek 40:44) and Its Place in the Cultic Terminology of the Temple," *ScrHier* 31 (1986) 49-62; B. Janowski, "Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen," *ZTK* 86 (1989) 389-454; J. Jeremias, *Das Königtum Gottes in den Psalmen. FRLANT* 141 (1987); H. Junker, "Die literarische Art von Is 5,1-7," *Bibl* 40 (1959) 259-66; J. W. Kleinig, *The Lord's Song: The Basis, Function and Significance of Choral Music in Chronicles. JSOTSup* 156 (1993) (with bibliog.); idem, "The Divine Institution of the Lord's Song in Chronicles," *JSOT* 55 (1992) 75-83; J. Köberle, *Die Tempelsänger im AT* (Erlangen, 1899); G. Krinetzki, *Kommentar zum Hohenlied. Bildsprache und theologische Botschaft. BBET* 16 (1981); H. Kruse, "Psalm CXXXII and the Royal Zion Festival," *VT* 33 (1983) 279-97; J. Liver, *Chapters in the History of the Priests and Levites: Studies in the Lists of Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah* (Jerusalem, 1968); C. Mabee, "Jacob and Laban: The Structure of Judicial Proceedings (Genesis XXXI 25-42)," *VT* 30 (1980) 192-207; J. Marböck, "Der Gott des Neuen und das neue Lied," *Ein Gott — eine Offenbarung. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese, Theologie und Spiritualität. FS N. Füglister* (Würzburg, 1991), 205-21; F. Matheus, *Singt dem Herrn ein neues Lied. SBS* 141 (1990); D. Michel, *Untersuchungen zur Eigenart des Buches Qohelet. BZAW* 183 (1989); T. C. Mitchell, "The Music of the OT Reconsidered," *PEQ* 124 (1992) 124-43; R. Mosis, "'Mit Jauchzen werden sie ernten'. Beobachtungen zu Psalm 126," *Die alttestamentliche Botschaft als Wegweisung. FS H. Reinelt* (Stuttgart, 1990), 181-201; H. P. Nasuti, *Tradition History and the Psalms of Asaph. SBLDS* 88 (1988); H. Niehr, "Zur Gattung von Jes 5,1-7," *BZ* 30 (1986) 99-104; G. S. Ogden, "Qoheleth XI 7–XII 8: Qoheleth's Summons to Enjoyment and Reflection," *VT* 34 (1984) 27-38; D. L. Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy. SBLMS* 23 (1977); H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982); G. von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes. BWANT* IV/3 (1930); F. Renfroe, "Persiflage in Psalm 137," *Ascribe to the Lord. FS P. C. Craigie. JSOTSup* 67 (1988) 509-27, esp. 518-19; A. Ruffing, *Jahwekrieg als Weltmetapher. Studien zu Jahwekriegstexten des chronistischen Sondergutes. SBB* 24 (1992); M. Sæbø, "Eschaton und Eschatologie im AT — in traditionsgeschichtlicher Sicht," *Alttestamentlicher Glaube und biblische Theologie. FS H. D. Preuss*

one should instead read *h'šr,* "the rich one."[21] The root is, however, attested in Jewish Aramaic and Christian Palestinian Aramaic.[22]

5. *Elsewhere.* Otherwise the root *šyr* is attested only in later languages, e.g., in a disputed Punic witness as *mš'rt* (pl. fem. piel ptcp.), "songstress" or "doorkeeper."[23] In Mandaic, *širana* is a poetic expression for "music."[24] The South Semitic languages, including Arabic, generally draw their terminology for "song" and "music" from the root *zmr* (cf. Heb. *zāmar*[25]).

According to M. Delcor, the Phoenician inscription from Kition is to be given a completely different reading; for *wl'dmm 'š 'l dl . . . l'dm b'r,* "for the curtain guards and for those who stand/watch at the door . . . the *b'r*-people," he proposes reading *lšrm b'r,* "for the singers in the town."[26] Despite the lack of additional reliable witnesses for the root in Phoenician, this reading does yield a cogent sentence.

Fabry

II. OT Use.

1. *Forms and Occurrences.* Both the verb and the noun occur with disproportionate frequency in two areas: in the Psalter on the one hand, and in Ezra/Nehemiah and Chronicles on the other.

The root *šyr,* "sing, song(s), singing," occurs 70 times in the Psalter, including 27 times as a verb (qal only) and 43 as a substantive (sg. only; 34 times in the superscriptions). The *nomen unitatis šîrâ* occurs only in Ps. 18:1(Eng. S) par. 2 S. 22:1. In Ps. 42:9(8) there is no need to assume the presence of scribal error and to emend *šyrh* (orthographical variant of *šyrw*) to *šîrâ.*[27] One noteworthy feature with regard to the verb is the concentration of summons to the self and to others with the plural imperative (10 times), cohortative singular (8 times), and cohortative plural (once). Because the imperfect in Ps. 59:17(16) has an obligatory character and the jussive in 138:5 the nature of a summons, the imperative component is thus absent only in 7:1(S) (sg. pf.); 68:26(25) and 87:7 (ptcp.); and 65:14(13) and 106:12 (impf.). The substantive is used absolutely 14 times, 28 times in construct expressions, including twice (Ps. 18:1[S] and 137:3) as the *nomen rectum* (דִּבְרֵי שִׁיר[ה]). Another noteworthy feature is the reserve in using suffixed forms, which occur only in 28:7 (1st person sg.) and 42:9(8)

21. "The Khirbet El-Qom Inscription," *VT* 37 (1987) 50-62, esp. 51-52, 61. See also G. I. Davies, *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions* (Cambridge, 1991), 106.

22. See *HAL,* IV, 1479, 1481; *WTM,* IV, 549; M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat-Gan, 1990), 548-49.

23. See *DNSI,* II, 1130-31; *HAL,* IV, 1480; on the frequently attested *šyrh* in Palmyrene, "caravan," → שׁוּר *šûr* II.

24. *MdD,* 463.

25. *HAL,* I, 273-74.

26. "Le personell du temple d'Astarte à Kition d'après une tablette phénicienne (CIS 86 A et B)," *UF* 11 (1979) 153-54, following J. B. Peckham, "Notes on a Fifth-Century Phoenician Inscription from Kition, Cyprus (CIS 86)," *Or* 37 (1968) 304-24, esp. 311 n. 1. See *KAI* 37A.6-7.

27. See F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Zenger, *Die Psalmen I. NEB* 29 (1993), 267-68.

musicians, while 1 K. 10:12 probably refers to musicians at the royal court as well as in the temple. The qal participle accordingly generally refers to secular music. By contrast, *šîrâ* almost always has sacral reference (secular in Isa. 23:15; Sir. 51:29). The cohortative and imperative of *šîr* always appear in religious and sacral contexts. Only in exceptional instances are summons issued for secular songs (one exception is the "song of the prostitute" in Isa. 23:16, which summons the forgotten prostitute to "sing many songs," though the noun rather than the infinitive is usually used). Although the Song of the Unfruitful Vineyard (Isa. 5:1-7) seems initially like a secular song, its end reveals its ultimately religious orientation (cf. also the identity of the "friend" suggested by the formulation). One might also note that songs whose wording is presented are usually religious and sacral songs (Ex. 15:1a,1b-18; 15:20-21a,21b; Dt. 31:30; 32:1-43; Jgs. 5:1,2-31a; 2 S. 22:1-2a,2b-51; Isa. 5:1-7; 26:1a,1b-6; 42:10ff.; Job 33:27). Only the songs cited in 1 S. 18:6-7a,7b and Isa. 23:15-16 are of a secular nature, whereas the Song of the Well in Nu. 21:17a,17b-18a cannot be unequivocally characterized as secular in that contextually Yahweh is clearly the one bestowing the water; finally, Canticles (cf. Cant. 1:1) is easily accessible to allegorical interpretation.

3. *Synonyms.* In the Psalter the subst. *šîr* appears with *mizmôr* 14 times (30:1[S]; 48:1[S]; 65:1[S]; 66:1; 67:1[S]; 68:1[S]; 75:1[S]; 76:1[S]; 83:1[S]; 87:1; 88:1[S]; 92:1[S]; 98:1; 108:1[S]). Terms appearing in *parallelismus membrorum* with the subst. *šîr* include *tᵉhillâ* (40:4[3]; 149:1), *tôḏâ* (69:31[30]), and *śimḥâ* (137:3). In the immediate context one also finds *maʿaśî* (according to *BHS,* "my song," 45:2[1]), *tᵉpillâ* and *rinnâ* (88:3[2]), *tᵉhillâ* (65:2[1]; 66:2), and *taḥᵃnûn* (130:2). In 7:1(S) *šiggāyôn* is the object of *šîr.* The verb is associated in *parallelismus membrorum* with *hēṭîḇ naggēn biṯrûʿâ* (33:3), *zmr* II (21:14[13]; 27:6; 57:8[7]; 68:5[4]; 101:1; 104:33; 105:2; 108:2[1]; 144:9); *sll* (68:5[4][32]); *ʿlz* (68:5[4]); *śîaḥ* (105:2); *rānan* (59:17[16]); *gîl* (13:6[5]); *zāḇaḥ ziḇḥê tᵉrûʿâ* (27:6); *hôḏîaʿ ʾᵉmûnāṯᵉḵā* (89:2[1]); *rwʿ* (65:14[13]); *heʾᵉmîn biḏḇārāyw* (106:12). In the extended context one finds *zmr* II (7:18[17]; 57:8[7]; 59:18[17]; 98:4-5; 105:2; 108:2[1]; 138:1; 149:3); *yāḏâ* hiphil (7:18[17]; 57:10[9]; 89:6[5]; 105:1; 106:1; 108:4[3]; 138:1); *spr* (96:3); *hāḇû kāḇôḏ wāʿōz, hāḇû kᵉḇôḏ šᵉmô, nāśaʾ minḥâ, bôʾ lᵉḥaṣrôṯāyw* (96:7-8); *hištaḥᵃwâ, ḥîl* (96:9); *ʾāmar* (96:10); *śāmaḥ* (96:11; 104:34; 105:3; 106:5; 149:2); *gîl* (89:17[16]; 96:11; 149:2); *rʿm* (96:11; 98:7); *ʿālaz* (96:12; 149:5); *rānan* (89:13[12]; 96:12; 98:4,8); *rwʿ* (98:4,6); *pāṣaḥ* (98:4); *māḥāʾ-ḵāp* (98:8); *hll* II (105:3,45; 106:1,48; 149:3); *hillēl bᵉmāḥôl* (149:3); *qārāʾ bᵉšēm, yāḏaʿ* hiphil (105:1); *dāraš, biqqēš* (105:4); *zāḵar* (105:5); *brk* (104:35; 106:48; 144:1); *šbḥ* (106:47); *šāḥâ* (138:2).

No real synonyms appear in Ezra/Nehemiah and Chronicles; only 1 Ch. 16:9 par. Ps. 105:5 use the parallel expression *zāmar.* A clearly circumscribed word field, however, does emerge through which individual functional aspects of temple music are disclosed. This word field includes *hll* piel and *ydh* hiphil (Neh. 12:24,46; 1 Ch. 16:4 [also *zkr* hiphil]; 23:5,30; 2 Ch. 5:13; 31:2; etc.); *šmʿ* hiphil (Neh. 12:42; 1 Ch. 15:16; 19:28;

---

32. Concerning *slh* see *GesB,* 544-45.

as a subject (Dt. 31:19,21). The expression *diḇrê haššîrâ hazzō'ṯ* occurs 3 times (Dt. 31:30; 32:44 [with *kōl*]; 2 S. 22:1 par. Ps. 18:1[S]), always as a direct object to the 3rd person singular masculine narrative (Ps. 18:1[S]: pf.) of *dibber,* corresponding to the construct state. Apart from these passages, *šîr* or *šîrâ* is also the direct object of *dibber* in Jgs. 5:12, albeit in a wordplay with "Deborah." The expression *šîrîm wᵉšîrôṯ* appears in 2 S. 19:36(35) and Eccl. 2:8. The combination *hᵃmôn šîrāyiḵ/šîreyḵā* ("sound/music of your songs") occurs in Ezk. 26:13 (fem. suf.) and Am. 5:23 (masc. suf.).

In the absolute state, *šîr* can also refer to "instruments" (*kᵉlê-šîr,* Am. 6:5) or instrument groups (*mînê šîr,* Sir. 39:15; *nᵉgînôṯ šîr,* Sir. 47:9, "stringed instruments").

In the context of the noun and vb. *šîr,* musical instruments used in accompaniment are often mentioned relatively frequently, including tambourines (e.g., Ex. 15:20); hand-held lyres (e.g., Gen. 31:27); standing lyres (e.g., Am. 5:23); flutes (e.g., Isa. 30:29); lutes (? *šālîšîm,* 1 S. 18:6, hapax legomenon); *ngn* piel, "play" (e.g., Isa. 23:16). The general context of *šîr* also includes expressions for joy (*śimḥâ,* e.g., 1 S. 18:6; *māśôś,* Isa. 24:8) and dancing (*mᵉḥōlâ,* e.g., Ex. 15:20; *śḥq* piel, 1 S. 18:7). By contrast, the context of the noun *šîrâ* rarely includes terms indicating the various aspects of musical performance (2 S. 22:50 par. Ps. 18:50[49], *zmr;* Sir. 39:15).

Additional expressions include *šîr ʿᵃgāḇîm,* "love song" (Ezk. 33:32); *šîraṯ dôḏî,* "song of friendship" (NRSV "love song") (Isa. 5:1); *šîraṯ hazzôneh,* "prostitute's song" (Isa. 23:15); *šîr ḥāḏāš,* "a new song" (Isa. 42:10; *šîrôṯ hêḵāl,* "temple/palace songs" (Am. 8:3); *šîr haššîrîm,* "song of songs" (Cant. 1:1);[33] *bᵉnôṯ haššîr,* "tones, voices, songs, songstresses"[34] (Eccl. 12:4); *mišpaṭ šîr,* "a proper song" (Sir. 35/32:5). Note also *biblíon tḗs ǭdḗs,* "songbook" (3 K. 8:53a LXX) with no parallel in the Hebrew.

Brunert — Kleer — Steins

5. *Important Uses.* a. *Psalter.* The question regarding the meaning of the root *šyr* in the Psalter depends on three preliminary hermeneutical considerations. (1) The almost exclusive appearance of *šyr* in the superscriptions and in summonses, i.e., virtually never in genuine narrative contexts, makes it difficult to determine the meaning of the root in that these contexts all involve areas whose own interpretation depends to a large extent on one's interpretation of the Psalter as a whole and of its origin. Not surprisingly, controversial answers are given to questions regarding the subject of singing (or of the summons to sing), the addressee (as a listener of the song or as the addressee of the summons), the life setting or *Sitz im Leben* (private piety, cult, literature), and, related to all these considerations, the date of origin and theological import. To that extent, the diverging interpretations of the *šîr* passages reflect the different models of Psalm exegesis.

(2) Use of the root in the superscriptions is additionally complicated by the frequent association of *šîr* with terms whose own meaning is not yet entirely clear, and by the association of *šîr* with superscriptions to psalms that modern exegetes assign to some-

---

33. See II.5.c below.

34. On the various translations see *HAL,* IV, 1482.

ers. In these songs, then, *šîr* joins other terms associated with proclamation. This group, which with a consciousness of distress and suffering sets out to sing God's hymnic praises, also includes Ps. 104 with its self-summons (v. 33), even though this psalm, rather than referring to a concrete situation of distress, addresses rather the more general notion of inevitable human transitoriness. At the same time, 104:34 reveals the song's double goal (discernible in other passages as well): to be pleasing to God while simultaneously expressing the psalmist's own joy (here: joy in God). All these songs are characterized by hymnic power deriving from a nearness to God either already experienced or at least sensed. In this connection it is of central significance that these songs not only represent human reaction and response to God's saving intervention, but, as 30:12-13(11-12) suggests and 40:4(3) states explicitly, themselves derive from God's intervention (see the discussion below regarding the "new song").

(2) This basically hymnic group of songs can be distinguished from a second group that includes Ps. 7; 88; 130; 131 ("woman's song"), which secondary superscriptions designate as *šîr* or associate with the vb. *šîr* (7:1[S]). Traditional genre-historical exegesis has generally classified these psalms as individual laments because they bring to expression elements of thanksgiving, trust, and praise clearly at the expense of a more broadly drawn description of the lament itself. Indeed, except for the (albeit central) address *yhwh ᵓᵉlōhê yᵉšûʿāṯî* in v. 2(1), Ps. 88 consists exclusively of elements of petition and lament, while in Ps. 7 the song *(šîr)* sung by David is described as a *šiggāyôn*, "lament." Hence at least from the perspective of the redactors responsible for these superscriptions, a *šîr* can also include a song in which trust in God, while not explicitly stated, constitutes the implicit presupposition for the songs to be sung meaningfully in the first place. In that sense these songs too are songs of trust.

(3) Alongside songs sung by individuals, one also encounters those sung by larger groups or even by the entire people. Among such songs, the few that focus on elements of petition and lament constitute a third *šîr* group. Here the situation resembles that in the songs of the individual, since they are sung (or are to be sung) in times of distress when the group trusts and hopes in deliverance by Yahweh. The redactors responsible for the superscriptions thought that such songs included Ps. 83; 123; and 126, and they accordingly recommended that they be sung in times of oppression and derision by enemies or in the difficult period of readjustment immediately following deliverance from the exile.[37] In such times of distress and in such songs, authors recall the past glory of David and anticipate a new (messianic?[38]) period of salvation (144:9). According to 137:4, songs drawing hope for the present from past salvific deliverance are not possible "in a foreign land."

Despite the fact that genre research generally classifies these psalms as collective psalms of lament, all these *šîrîm* resemble the songs of the individual discussed above in that they are borne by trust in Yahweh and in fact are possible only because of such trust. It is doubtful that Ps. 121; 125; and 129, traditionally classified as songs of

---

37. By contrast, see ibid. on Ps. 83 (preexilic) and Mosis on Ps. 126 (eschatological).
38. A. Deissler, *Die Psalmen* (Düsseldorf, ⁵1986), 555.

do individual (and in this sense more private) songs on having a broader effect. To that end, they contain comprehensive and in part universal summonses to praise or other references to universal praise (33:8; 48:3,11[2,10]; 65:6,9[5,8]; 66:1,4-5,8,16; 67:4-6,8[3-5,7]; 68:30,33[29,32]; 76:11[10]; 87:4-7; 89:2,6[1,5]) whose logical relationship with the explicit mention of a *šîr* should not be overlooked even if such is not found in the immediate context. Even where no reference to such intentions of praise or mission for a song are even present (Ps. 92; 106; 122; 124; 149), such intentions do indeed emerge from the status of the psalm within the various psalms groups. Redactional and canonical-historical exegesis, for example, disclose the significance of Ps. 92 for the ultimately universal spread of the Yahweh faith.[41]

What are known as the royal psalms occupy a thematically determined special position among the hymnic *šîrîm.* As wedding songs for the king (Ps. 45), as songs of thanksgiving (Ps. 18) or enthronement (Ps. 101) associated with the king, they are closely tied to the institution and idea of kingship; the superscriptions to Ps. 18 and 101 ascribe them to David. Ps. 45, which the superscription classifies as *maśkîl šîr y^e^dîdōṯ,* corresponds to ancient Near Eastern royal wedding songs and is moreover unique within the Psalter in its proximity to the language and content of Canticles. Scholars disagree whether the lack of congruence between the characterization of this psalm as *šîr y^e^dîdōṯ,* "love song," in v. 1(S) and the content of the song especially in vv. 2-10,17-18(1-9,16-17) might lead to a new translation of *šîr y^e^dîdōṯ* or is showing that what was originally a royal psalm has been redactionally reworked into a new song to "messianic love" (see the discussion of Isa. 5:1 below).[42] But however it be resolved, the discussion changes nothing regarding the unique and provocative thematic orientation of this song. By contrast, elements and features associated with a royal song as found in the other psalms designated superscriptionally as *šîr* (Ps. 89:20-38[19-37]; 132:11-12: retrospective on the dynasty and assurances of its longevity to David; 21:14[13]; 144:9-10: song to Yahweh, who helps the king [David] to victory) can be integrated effortlessly into the Yahweh faith. On the whole, however, the classification proposals regarding the royal psalms/songs similarly reflect the various directions of psalm exegesis in the larger sense and extend from historical and cultic interpretations, messianic and eschatological-messianic interpretations, on to the assumption of a collective focus within the theocratic milieu of the postexilic period.[43] Although the semantic elements of *šîr* do not offer adequate information for deciding these and similar controversies, the passages do at least show that the term *šîr* is not to be construed sociologically, since even a king can provide the content and be the singer of a *šîr.*

The Yahweh-kingship psalms, among which Ps. 96 and 98 issue the summons (v. 1)

---

41. See Zenger, "Israel und Kirche."

42. For the former see K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja 1 (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 ([2]1989), 167, who proposes "song of the (female) friends" (i.e., friends of the bride, sung to the bridal pair). For the latter see Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalmen I,* 278-79.

43. Historical: Schmidt and others; cultic: Benzten, 27, on Ps. 45; Widengren, 78, on Ps. 45; messianic: Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalmen I,* 278-79 on Ps. 45; eschatological-messianic: Deissler, *Psalmen,* 24-25 et passim; postexilic collective: Becker.

to sing a "new song to Yahweh" (see below), exhibit their own, peculiar thematic focus in that they praise Yahweh as the judge, king, and master of all earthly rulers and summon the rest of the world to praise him as such as well. The universal orientation of these psalms employs explicitly eschatological forms, summoning the entirety of nature to glorify Yahweh (96:11-12; 98:7-8).

Since S. Mowinckel, eschatological interpretations of the Yahweh-kingship psalms are countered by those that locate them within various cultic celebrations.[44] Although Mowinckel's thesis of the enthronement festival was criticized from the very outset and to an ever increasing degree, a revised understanding of the Babylonian New Year festival has recently renewed discussion of that thesis.[45] A. Weiser associates these as well as the majority of other psalms with the covenant cultic festival, while H.-J. Kraus refers to a royal Zion festival and J. Jeremias to a cultic act in connection with the ark procession.[46]

Although the *šîrîm* among the royal psalms and the psalms of Yahweh's kingship are, on the whole, songs of praise to Yahweh like the other hymnic songs, they are distinguished from the latter by their explicit and central reference to kingship in its historical or messianic/eschatological form.

(5) By contrast, the themes of the final thematically determined *šîr* group, namely, the three wisdom psalms 127; 128; and 133 from the songs of pilgrimage (*šîr hamma'ᵃlôṯ,* Ps. 120–34), are taken from daily life. These songs celebrate a successful life blessed by God (Ps. 127), familial happiness based on fear of God (Ps. 128), and the joy of harmonious happiness (Ps. 133). Here, during the postexilic period, the hymnic intentions discernible in the psalms already discussed are developed didactically for the first time.

A survey of the use of the root in the Psalter yields differing results in the psalms themselves and in the superscriptions. The psalms corpus understands *šîr* in an exclusively positive sense as a song of trust, thanksgiving, and praise. Such songs are sung during actual times of crisis and often express confidence that deliverance will indeed come; they are also sung as a retrospective on past deliverance. Speakers include (otherwise unidentified) individuals, including women (with regard to Ps. 131, one might ask whether women might be the intended speakers or singers in other psalms of the individual as well) and the king, though also groups (private prayer circles, cultic communities, Israel, or, in psalms with a more universal orientation, all of humankind). Although scholars disagree regarding whether and, if so, where cultic musicians might perform entire songs or individual passages on behalf of others (king, Levites, people), they tend to advocate such a view more consistently where, in the tradition of S. Mowinckel, the Psalter as a whole is understood as having been at home in a cultic milieu. The content of these songs is Yahweh's salvific acts on behalf of the individual or people, acts sometimes concretely identified, typologically

44. See the overview in Janowski, 424ff.

45. Cf. Welten, 302ff.; Janowski.

46. A. Weiser, *Psalms. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962); H.-J. Kraus, *Theology of the Psalms. CC* (Eng. trans. 1986), 116; Jeremias, 158 et passim.

evoked, or circumscribed in a summary fashion; this semantic content explains the frequent if not exclusive appearance of this root in vows of or summonses to praise and thanksgiving. Although *šîr* can very well stand alone in such contexts (106:12), as a rule it is associated at least in the broader context with other expressions of joy and thanksgiving. Although references to instrumental accompaniment for the song are often present as well, they are not constitutive.[47] Songs can also be accompanied by dancing and be embedded in sacrificial contexts. Frequent combinations with certain similar expressions, especially combinations using *šîr* and *zāmar* in summonses to oneself and to others, suggest the presence of fixed literary topoi. Conclusions regarding the actual content of such statements can be difficult, as can those regarding semantic distinctions, for example, between *šîr* and *zāmar* or between *šîr* and *mizmôr.*[48] A development of the use of the term in concrete situations into a more topical understanding of the sort Seidel presupposes to have occurred with regard to references to certain instruments probably also occurred with regard to *šîr* itself, though one can only say for sure that these songs could indeed but did not have to be accompanied by instruments and dancing.[49] In any event, they represent a constituent part of praise, a means of proclamation, an expression of joy and thanksgiving, and everywhere presuppose the desire to be pleasing to God.[50]

Use of the root in the superscriptions seems to be more differentiated than the use of *šîr* in the actual body of the psalms themselves. Although *šîr* is also used here with the familiar positive meaning, some superscriptions refer to what are clearly psalms of lament as *šîrîm.* In superscriptions the character of praise and thanksgiving cannot be viewed as part of the *constitutive* semantic features of this root. In this sense *šîr* defines neither a specific content nor a fixed genre and can thus not only parallel *tᵉhillâ* (Ps. 149:1; cf. also Isa. 42:10), but also be associated with the obj. *šiggāyôn* (Ps. 7:1[S]). As part of the superscriptions, *šîr* exhibits no specific semantic feature that might be used in answering questions of genre. Instead, in superscriptions *šîr* represents a neutral term yet in need of specification (e.g., *šîr yᵉḏîḏōṯ, šîr hammaʿᵃlôṯ*).

All the same, however, *šîr* does not seem to function in the superscriptions as a specific technical musical term either. Militating against such a function is that the term can appear both unaccompanied by any additional technical musical terms (e.g., in the pilgrimage psalms) and with additional performance instructions *(mizmôr* [Buber: "a harp song"], *binginôṯ, lamᵉnaṣṣēaḥ, . . . ʿal).* The sporadic association of *šîr* with various musical instruments (see above) also militates against *šîr* referring to any one, specific form of musical performance. No basic schema with constitutive features in a fixed sequence of the sort Seidel presupposes for the psalm superscriptions as a whole can be discerned with regard to the use of *šîr* in the superscriptions.[51] At least as far as the Psalter is concerned, one cannot really maintain that a *šîr* is generally accompanied

---

47. See II.4 above.
48. On this discussion see Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* 21ff.
49. *Musik,* 158-59.
50. See Casetti, 384-89.
51. See "Untersuchungen zur Aufführungspraxis der Psalmen," 505.

musical assumption that the "new song" was an expression of the poetic and musical renewal of the musicians' service after the decree of Cyrus, comparable to the introduction of the ten-stringed harp as an instrument to accompany the solo vocalist.[62]

Brunert

b. *Ezra/Nehemiah and Chronicles.* The masc. pl. polel ptcp. *m^ešōr^erîm* (on the only occurrence of the fem. pl., see below) occurs only in Ezra/Nehemiah and Chronicles, where it refers in a majority of cases to the special group of musicians at the Jerusalem temple. The close relationship between singing and instrumental accompaniment suggests that the usual translation of the expression as "singers" is too narrow.[63] These books do not use the qal participle to refer to this particular group of cultic servants. No reference to the temple cult is discernible in 2 Ch. 35:25 (laments at the death of Josiah). The "lists of returnees" in Ezra 2 par. Neh. 7 mention musicians alongside other cultic functionaries (Ezra 2:41,70 par. Neh. 7:44,72). Although Ezra 2:65 par. Neh. 7:67 also use the unique expression *m^ešōr^erîm ûm^ešōr^erôṯ*, "male and female musicians," the position within the "addendum" of the lists of returnees suggests that the reference is not to cultic music, but rather to some secular service (underscoring the joyous nature of the return home or the wealth of the returnees[64]).

At first glance, Chronicles presents a rather confusing picture of the various classes of musicians. Alongside Asaph, heads of musicians also include Heman and Ethan, and from 1 Ch. 16 on Jeduthun in place of Ethan. The hierarchy of the leading musicians also seems to differ in the different contexts. H. Gese has proposed the most complete explanation of the genesis of this system of cultic musicians. His traditio-historical reconstruction suggests that the overall system of musician classes developed in four stages. During the early postexilic period, the "sons of Asaph" were the only group of musicians and were still to be distinguished genealogically from the Levites (cf. the lists of returnees in Ezra 2 par. Neh. 7). The list in Neh. 11, which Gese dates a bit later, mentions a Jeduthun group (v. 17) alongside that of Asaph, both groups now being subsumed under the Levites. In the immediate context of the Chronicler's basic stratum, a Heman group emerges; Gese maintains that these texts belong to the basic stratum of Chronicles and reflect the trio of musician leaders Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun as well as the leading position enjoyed by Asaph. In the fourth stage, Asaph loses his leadership position to Heman; the name Jeduthun is replaced by Ethan (who, like Heman, appears in 1 K. 5:11[4:31]). This later developmental stage comes to expression in what Gese thinks are post-Chronicler texts, 1 Ch. 6:16ff.(31ff.) and 15:16ff. 1 Ch. 25 constitutes a special case in that even though it is to be dated after the fourth stage, it nonetheless still emphasizes the leading position of Heman while maintaining the name of Jeduthun.

---

62. *Musik,* 158-59, 212.

63. *HAL,* IV, 1481-82; cf. Liver, 53.

64. For the former see, e.g., A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Esra. KAT* XIX/1 (1985), 66; for the latter, H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah. WBC* 16 (1985), 98; on this issue in general see Hurvitz, 56.

be dated before any "leviticalization" of musicians, since it still mentions the musicians apart from the Levites.[68] Although this assumption may indeed be true, it cannot be demonstrated. The redaction of 1 Ch. 6 (vv. 16-38[31-53]) associates the musicians rather "artificially," i.e., in the manner of conscious scholarly combination, with the three traditional Levitical clans of Kohath, Gershom, and Merari. The basis for the association of Heman with the Kohathites/Korahites and thus for the preeminent position of Heman seems to be the juxtaposition of "Korahites" and "Heman" (here still the "wise" one rather than a musician; cf. 1 K. 5:11[4:31]) in the superscription to Ps. 88. The "leviticalization" probably did not originate in this particular redaction; more likely this complex lends expression to an existing consciousness (or claim) that the musicians belonged to the tribe of Levi, the only tribe that could legitimately perform cultic functions (cf. the determinative regulations in Numbers and Dt. 10; 18).

According to the Chronicler's understanding, the temple music as a whole (personnel, instrumentation, songs, duties) goes back to David, who is described as a "man of God" only in this connection (cf. Neh. 12:24,36; 2 Ch. 8:14) in order (among other things) to emphasize his role in establishing the temple cult, a role analogous to that of Moses:[69]

- David appoints the musicians to their temple service (1 Ch. 6:16-17[31-32]; 1 Ch. 15–16; 25; 2 Ch. 23:18; Neh. 11:23; 12:46),[70] Solomon implements these measures after the completion of the temple (cf. 1 Ch. 6:17[32]; 2 Ch. 8:14); Hezekiah renews this institution (2 Ch. 31:2).
- David is the "creator" *('ōśeh)* of the Levitical musical instruments, of the handheld and standing lyres, and of the cymbals (Neh. 12:36; 1 Ch. 23:5; 2 Chr. 7:6; 29:26-27); by contrast, the trumpets blown by the priests are not associated with David.
- Alongside Asaph, David is the composer of the cultic songs (2 Ch. 29:30); this may also be the meaning of the difficult text Neh. 12:46.
- David defines the tasks of the Levitical musicians (apart from priestly functions), especially the "perpetual" *(tāmîḏ)* participation in sacrifices (cf. 1 Ch. 6:16-17[31-32]; 23:30; Neh. 11:23; 12:45; etc.), and establishes their post or station *(ma'ᵃmāḏ)* in the temple during the liturgy (1 Ch. 23:28-31 et passim);[71] according to Neh. 9:4 and Mish. *Mid.* 6–7, the reference is to a pedestal between the forecourts of the priests and the Israelites.[72]

The association of temple musicians with prophetic terminology typical of Chronicles can be interpreted without recourse to sparsely attested and thus problematical tra-

---

68. See W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia. HAT* I/20 (1949), 23; Gese, "Zur Geschichte."

69. Cf. Abadie, de Vries, and Kleinig's detailed attempt to articulate the Chronicler's overall understanding of temple music.

70. On the attempt to legitimize these Levitical tasks, which were new as far the regulations of the Torah were concerned, see Kleinig.

71. On the concept of the defined station in cultic services, see Hauge.

72. See Kleinig, *Lord's Song,* 69-74.

ditions of preexilic cultic prophecy.[73] 1 Ch. 25:5; 2 Ch. 29:30; and 35:15 do not refer to all musicians as *ḥōzeh,* "seer," but only to the heads of the musicians: Heman, Asaph, and Jeduthun.[74] Hence in the syntactically confused formulation in 1 Ch. 25:1, the apposition *hannᵉḇîʾîm* refers to the previously mentioned heads of the musicians, not to their descendants as a whole. It is not the musicians who are qualified as "prophets"; rather, the institution of temple music as such is traced back to a divine *miṣwâ* mediated by prophets (cf. 2 Ch. 29:25).[75]

That the activities of the musicians should not be understood as covering merely the lesser aspects of cultic service emerges in those passages that use the semantically still unclear expression *lᵉnaṣṣēaḥ* to assign to the Levites what are apparently quite central administrative tasks in the temple because of their knowledge of the instruments of temple music (cf. Ezra 3:8-9; 1 Ch. 15:21; 23:4; 2 Ch. 34:12; cf. Neh. 11:22). The doorkeepers, who are frequently mentioned alongside the musicians, apparently fulfilled similarly important functions.[76] Yet another task of the Levitical musicians in Ezra/Nehemiah and Chronicles is care of Israel's sacred traditions. "The frequent mention of 'singers' clearly shows the importance the Chronicler attached to their functions. This certainly does not mean merely that the Chronicler was a music enthusiast, nor are the singers' guilds to be mistaken for male choral groups. The reference is rather to guilds that dedicated themselves to the traditions of cultic music, passed those traditions down (which also always means: interpreted them and changed them), and understood how to perform them properly. Hence one can probably associate the activities of the singers with that other, comprehensive Levitical task of 'guarding' (שׁמר), cultivating, and passing on the sacred traditions. From this perspective it seems extremely likely that these late postexilic Levites and Levitical singers were precursors of the Masoretes, a thesis recently proposed by M. Gertner and maintained by some of the Masoretes themselves."[77]

2 Ch. 20:21 deserves special attention. Büchler already pointed out that the stereotypical language of cultic music used by the Chronicler is absent.[78] In the positive sense, noteworthy features include the designation of music as *rinnâ,* which in the Chronicler's original material occurs only here, then also the unique combinations *mᵉšōrᵉrîm* + *lᵉyhwh* and *mᵉhalᵉlîm* + *lᵉhaḏraṯ-qōḏeš,* and the introduction (similarly unique in the Chronicler) of the thematic line "O give thanks to Yahweh" with *wᵉʾōmᵉrîm* (cf. 1 Ch. 16:34 par. Ps. 106:1; 1 Ch. 16:41; 2 Ch. 5:13; 7:3,6). Hence 2 Ch. 20:21 does not derive from the comprehensive redaction in Ezra/Nehemiah and Chron-

---

73. See esp. S. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien;* idem, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship* (Eng. trans., repr. 2 vols. in 1; Nashville, 1967).

74. See Nasuti, 177-78.

75. For the former see Petersen, Then; for the latter see Kleinig, Steins. On the issue of the legitimacy of temple music, see the discussion in Bab. *ʿArak.* 11.

76. Detailed documentation in Wright, "Guarding the Gates."

77. Gunneweg, *Leviten und Priester,* 214.

78. *ZAW* 19 (1899) 100-101.

Song of the Vineyard a "unique linguistic form . . . clearly differing from discernible related forms."[103]

The Song of the Vineyard is introduced by a (cohortative) self-summons for the prophet to sing (v. 1a). This form is generally found in hymnic songs and accordingly leads one to expect a song broadly characterized by joy and praise. The prep. *l*[e] associated here with the vb. *šîr* is elsewhere always (with the sole exception of Ps. 137:3) associated with a divine designation or with an appropriate suffix (outside the Psalter always with the Tetragrammaton). Even before the explanation in v. 7, this provides a clear indication of the divine identity of the "friend" even though *yāḏîd* usually refers to God's "beloved" in the OT.[104] Höffken translates v. 1a: "Let me sing for (on behalf of, instead of) my beloved friend the song of my friend concerning his vineyard."[105] The notion that the prophet will sing his friend's song in the latter's stead, however, is problematic, since vv. 1b,2 speak of the "friend" in the 3rd person.[106] Having the song not begin until v. 3 is as unpersuasive as a literary-critical solution.[107] In the expression *šîr l*[e], the preposition otherwise can mean both "of, about (Yahweh)" and "for (Yahweh)" or "to the honor of (Yahweh),"[108] a semantic scope similarly presupposed in Isa. 5:1a: "Let me sing of my friend and to his glory."

Although the expression *šîraṯ dôḏî* is generally rendered as "song of my friend, beloved, love," apart from the previously mentioned problem with regard to vv. 1b,2 one also notices the change in the designation of the "friend" (*yāḏîḏ* twice; *dôḏ* once), whose explanation as a wordplay does not seem plausible, suggesting that *šîraṯ dôḏ[î]* actually represents a fixed expression referring not to the song of the friend that this (nonsinging) friend might have composed, but to "(my) song of the friend" that goes back to the prophetic singer.[109] The *Sitz im Leben* of the presupposed genre "friend's song" can only be surmised. In any event, the indication of the song's content "concerning his vineyard" does evoke a love topos (Cant. 1:6; 2:15; 6:11; 8:11-12). The expression *šîraṯ dôḏ* recalls *šîraṯ y*[e]*ḏîḏōṯ* in Ps. 45:1(S), which H. Wildberger prefers to render as "song of the female friends" (of the bride) rather than as the customary "song of love" or "love song."[110] On this view the genre of Ps. 45 would derive from a song in which the bride's female friends serenade the bride and groom on the occasion of their

---

103. Höffken, 401.

104. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12. CC* (Eng. trans. 1991), 179-80.

105. Höffken, 396 n. 15.

106. See Cersoy, 42; Schottroff, 76, while acknowledging the problem, still considers it "within the realm of poetic possibility."

107. So Höffken, 404ff. Cf. Cersoy, 42.

108. On this issue cf. de Boer, esp. 61-62; *HAL,* IV, 1480.

109. For the general rendering see, among others, Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 175; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. [2]1983), 89; Schottroff, 76. For the "wordplay" see Willis, 362. On the suffix in such expressions, cf., e.g., Dt. 1:41; *GK,* §135n; the expression "song of the friend" means something different here than Cersoy's "mon chant amical" or "le chant de mon amitié" (40-44) for the cj. *šîraṯ dôḏay.*

110. *Isaiah 1–12,* 180 ("Lied der Freundinnen," rendered in the Eng. trans. as "'song about the female loved one,' that is, the bride").

wedding (in a messianic interpretation of the final version of Ps. 45,[111] the female friends of the bride "daughter Zion" would be the nations). Commensurate with the "song of the female friends" (with *yāḏîḏ* and *šîr*) there would then also be a "song of the male friend" (with *dôḏ* and *šîrâ*) that one friend would sing to another at the occasion of the latter's wedding (cf. Junker's and others' understanding of the prophet as a "friend of the groom" who as a mediator in this case, however, and in view of what follows, allegedly performs a "song of his beloved concerning this vineyard" as a reproach against the bride[112]). On this view, in v. 1a the prophetic singer gives the impression that he is beginning a joyous, hymnlike "friend's song" of the sort normally found in connection with a wedding celebration and focusing on the bride and love ("vineyard") as well as on the groom/friend. "Let me sing of my friend and in his honor, let me sing my 'friend's song,' let me sing concerning his vineyard, his bride, and love, and in his honor." This announcement, however, which intends to get the attention of the listeners, is nonetheless already ambivalent to the attentive listener in that *šîr* with *l^e* points to the divine identity of the friend, while the metaphor of the vineyard is open for the land and people of Israel (Ps. 80; Jer. 2:21; Hos. 10:1), and because what actually follows in no way corresponds to the announced and thus anticipated "friend's song" (hence the Song of the Vineyard does not at all offer an example of a "friend's song"), serving rather the disclosure of guilt or Yahweh's own justification.

(5) Isa. 26:1 is noteworthy as the only passage using the hophal and the only passage using the expression *haššîr hazzeh.* The actual song itself in vv. 1b-6 is preceded by a secondary introduction in v. 1a *(bayyôm hāhû)* that turns the piece into an "eschatological song" and integrates it into the context of the Isaiah apocalypse.[113] By contrast, Kaiser doubts that the "prophetic song" introduced by v. 1a was originally independent, i.e., not dependent on the present context.[114] Assuming such original independence, the hymn's original life setting was probably a sanctuary processional on the occasion of a victory celebration, in which case it was a "cultic song."[115] Its insertion into the eschatological context secondarily turned it into an "eschatological cultic song" to which alone the designation "song" now applies in the present text (concerning *šîr* as a "cultic song," cf. Ps. 30:1[S]; 92:1[S]; Isa. 30:29; Am. 5:23). This eschatological context may also explain the hophal form in v. 1a. Because one must first determine who belongs to the "righteous nation *(gôy!)* that keeps faith" (v. 2), the passive form is best suited for keeping the subject of such singing open. Unlike the Song of the Vineyard, the prophetic song here is not a demonstration of guilt or an accusation, but an (eschatological) promise for the future, albeit not without implications for the present (cf. v. 4).

---

111. See Hossfeld and Zenger, *Psalmen I,* 278-84.

112. Junker, 264-65.

113. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27. CC* (Eng. trans. 1997), 455, 545. On its delimitation cf. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 205-6 n. f; Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 455.

114. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39,* 173-74, 206.

115. See Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 544-45; on the "song of victory/thanksgiving," see the enumeration in Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39,* 206 n. a.

(6) Outside the Psalter, the expression "new song" occurs only in Isa. 42:10. No consensus obtains regarding the end of the "new song" that begins in v. 10.[116] Quite apart from the clarification of the difficult question of the priority of the expression in either Ps. 96; 98; 149; or Isa. 42 (cf. the discussion above concerning the "new song" in the Psalter), the question remains concerning the basis and content of what is actually "new" in this "new song" in Deutero-Isaiah.

This question can be answered by the reference to the "earlier, later, and new" that constitutes an "essential compositional element of the first part of Deutero-Isaiah" (chs. 40–48).[117] Despite differences of opinion regarding the details of what is "earlier," interpreters generally agree that what is "new" consists in liberation from the exile (and the concomitant homecoming), which C. Westermann believes is viewed as "new" precisely because it is brought about not by Israel's own army and power but by the Persian king Cyrus.[118] Within the horizon of creation theology and a theology of history, what is "new" here is not a mere renewal or transformation, but rather a "phenomenon of something genuinely new — not there before yet somehow leaping forth from the midst of what was there before."[119]

Against this background, what is "new" in the "new song" in Deutero-Isaiah is not to be grasped so much under formal (as a "new type of psalm") or emotional criteria.[120] Rather, this "new song" is to be understood as an anticipatory response to the promise of Yahweh's new deed (v. 9: "and new things I now declare"; announced in the song itself in or from v. 13) through which he will genuinely call forth something new.[121] "A new song belongs to a new era."[122] If one interprets God's imminent intervention and new age eschatologically (in the sense of once and for all),[123] in which case Deutero-Isaiah would have deceived himself since it was not really attained through the return from exile, then this "new song" becomes an "eschatological" song. By contrast, Marböck points out that the "surprising and creative elements" of God's new acts are maintained even if one is more reserved regarding such eschatological interpretation.[124] Marböck believes that one finds only intimations in Deutero-Isaiah of such new acts of God in the sense of "once and for all," and to that extent the "new song" in Deutero-Isaiah can be called eschatological only with considerable qualification.[125] The expression "new song" also occurs in Judith's Hymn of Praise (Jdt. 16:1ff.), which Seidel associates with the worship services of the Maccabeans (*hýmnos kainós,* v. 13;

---

116. In v. 13: Elliger, *Deuterojesaja 1,* 242-45; in v. 17: J. L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah. AB* 20 (1968), 42-44; cf. also Darr.

117. Matheus, 140.

118. Westermann, *TLOT,* I, 395-96. Cf., among others, Matheus, 133-42.

119. R. North, → חדשׁ *ḥāḏāš (chādhāsh),* IV, 240.

120. For the former see C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 102; for the latter, Elliger, *Deuterojesaja 1,* 245.

121. See Matheus, 66, 136.

122. Gonda, 284.

123. With Elliger, *Deuterojesaja 1,* 245, 252.

124. Marböck, 208.

125. Ibid., 218.

as in Isa. 42:10 LXX).[126] Seidel remarks in this regard: "assuming the reestablishment of the cult in Jerusalem as the background, it makes sense to speak of a 'new song.'" Something analogous may also apply to the "new song" in Deutero-Isaiah. Because the catastrophe of 587 B.C.E. silenced all the (older) songs (cf. the analogous threat in Amos and the impossibility of singing "Yahweh's songs" during the exile, Ps. 137:2-4), the renewal of singing after this time of silence certainly makes it possible to use the designation "new song." Hence the "new song" is particularly well suited for the late exilic/early postexilic period.

One theologically significant element concerning the "new song" in Isa. 42 is that, compared with the victory songs in Ex. 15 and Jgs. 5, this song praises in an anticipatory fashion God's victorious intervention that still lies in the future (cf. *tᵉhillâ,* v. 10a, as a parallel); and not only Israel sings this song, but all the people of the world (sea, desert, mountains), the "whole of creation."[127] Hence the singing of this "new song" turns out to be a preeminent witness of faith.

(7) The genre of the Song of Moses described as a *šîrâ* in Dt. 31:30 and 32:1-43 is a "mixed form."[128] This song contains elements of wisdom and prophecy, a portrayal of the war of Yahweh, announcements and scenes of judgment, as well as hymnic elements. The more important elements for characterizing the Song of Moses are the statements made within the Dtr framework (Dt. 31:14-30; 32:44-52) according to which this song is to be "written," "taught," and "put into the mouths" of the Israelites (31:19,22) and serve as a "witness" among them (31:19,21; cf. also the summoning of heaven and earth as witnesses, 31:28; 32:1). The law is subject to the same activities of being written down and established as a witness (31:24,26; 32:46), raising the question regarding the relationship between the Song of Moses and the law in Dt. 31:14–32:52.

Eissfeldt divides Dt. 31:9–32:47 into two "mutually exclusive textual groups," with the one focusing on the law trying to displace the older group focusing on the Song of Moses so that the law might replace that song.[129] The law sections tried to "incorporate" the song sections and interpret them such that the song "was understood as a penetrating summary of the law." G. von Rad takes the opposite view, concluding that "whoever wanted to establish the Song of Moses securely as part of this block of traditions adopted for his purpose a form of words which treated originally of writing down the law."[130] Von Rad speaks further about the "double train of thought which speaks on the one hand of the Song . . . [and] on the other of the Law," G. Braulik about their conscious "paralleling" with the goal of summarizing the law in the song, and H. D. Preuss about the intentional "interweaving" of the song and the law.[131] Although all these views do point in the right direction, they do not rigorously examine the text in its final form.

---

126. *Musik,* 201.
127. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66,* 103. See Elliger, *Deuterojesaja 1,* 243, 248.
128. See Preuss, 167.
129. *KlSchr,* III, esp. 330-33.
130. *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 190.
131. Ibid., 201; Braulik, *Deuteronomium 1–16,17. NEB* 15 (1986), 235; Preuss, 164.

Between Dt. 31:22 and v. 24 the expression changes abruptly from "this song" *(haššîrâ hazzō'ṯ)* to the "words of this law" *(diḇrê hattôrâ-hazzō'ṯ;* cf. v. 30, *diḇrê haššîrâ hazzō'ṯ)*. After the song is performed, the narrative statement that "Moses came and recited all the words of this song" (32:44) is followed by the summons that Moses keep and observe "all the words of this law" (v. 46). This abrupt change between "song (of Moses)" and "law" forces the conclusion that at least the final redactor consciously identified the two (in Dt. 31:14–32:52).[132] The law and the song become one. A paralleling occurs at most between this (summarizing) "song-law" and the law Moses writes down in 31:9. Whereas the latter is given to the priests and elders to be read every seven years, the "song-law" is placed beside the ark, i.e., besides the tables of the law (10:5)

Far from representing some sort of musical activity (e.g., playing an instrument), the inspired Song of Moses represents Moses' testament (cf. the framework with the motif of Moses' death in 31:14-16[,27,29] and 32:48-52), especially in a legal context as a witness and as a law to be taught and learned.

(8) "Songs" also appear in a legal context in Gen. 31:27. H. Gunkel suspects that the reference is to a genre of joyous farewell songs evoking the notion of God's blessing, a safe journey, and a joyous homecoming.[133] This description, however, is not really adequate for the "songs" in this passage. The entire chapter Gen. 31 is characterized by legal language and juridical proceedings and ends with a treaty of trust between Jacob and Laban regulating the future of Laban's daughters. Against this background, "such a departure [by Jacob] from the family confederation was an act of violence"[134] or a violation of law. When in this context Laban speaks of "songs," he refers not to joyous farewell songs but apparently to a genre dealing with the transfer of daughters from the protective sphere of the father to that of the husband and to the accompanying establishment of a new family. In such a procedure of transfer, these "songs" would have had some sort of (here undefined) legal function. That no "songs" appear in 32:1(31:55) at the farewell derives from the fact that the legal proceedings have already been fulfilled by the making of the treaty and the following common meal.

(9) One important *Sitz im Leben* of songs is the activity of eating and drinking. Sirach explicitly admonishes those who are older to limit their instruction at meals and "do not interrupt the singing" (Sir. 35/32:3). He also compares the "proper song" *(mišpaṭ šîr)* at a banquet with a "ruby seal in a setting of gold" (35/32:5). These passages refer to "drinking songs" even though in this context *šîr* might be understood more comprehensively as (table) music. Concerning Isa. 24:9, H. Wildberger remarks that "as part of a festival celebration . . one would find wine and song, in fact, singing accompanied by music."[135] That this custom characterized especially the royal court can be seen from Barzillai's insistence that he not go up to Jerusalem with King David, since his advanced age prevented him from tasting "what he eats or what he drinks"

---

132. See also Casetti, 389.

133. *Genesis* (Eng. trans., Macon, Ga., 1997), 337.

134. G. von Rad, *Genesis. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1961), 309.

135. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27*, 485.

that the activities of the *šārîm* included not only singing but also playing instruments. "Musician" is thus the correct translation of the qal participle in other passages as well. The translation "singers"[151] makes sense only because it makes clear that the song was in any case an important element in such music.[152]

2 S. 19:36(35) and Eccl. 2:8 clearly associate musicians with the royal court, while Seidel suspects that professional musicians were already present at David's court.[153] 1 K. 10:12 mentions the temple and palace on equal footing such that the musicians cannot really be associated exclusively with one or the other institution. Given the close connection between the palace and temple during the Solomonic period, one can assume that the musicians were active in both places.[154] The only passage referring unequivocally to "temple musicians" (here with the qal ptcp.) is Ezk. 40:44, assuming one does not follow a conjecture here.[155]

Because apart from Prov. 25:20 the qal participle is always construed in the plural, one is probably correct in assuming the presence of groups of musicians in the palace and temple.

Kleer

III. 1. *LXX.* The LXX usually translates the vb. *šîr* as *ᾁdein,* though sometimes also as *hýmnein* and *psalmᾡdein;* it usually translates the nouns *šîr* and *šîrâ* as *ᾠdḗ,* though also as *ᾆsma* and *psalmós.*

2. *Qumran.* The root *šyr* occurs 30 times in Qumran, including 10 times in recently published mss. (with 7 occurrences of *šîrâ* [6 times in 4Q334] and the verb once). The remaining 20 occurrences (the noun 18 times, the verb 2) can be organized into two larger groups and several different individual passages: *lᵉmaśkîl* 9 times in song superscriptions (7 times in 4QShirShabb [3 more might be reconstructed]; 4Q511 [bis]); 6 times in the "compositions of David" (11QPsᵃ 27);[156] finally 3Q6 1, 2; 4Q381 31, 9; 413 1, 1; 427 7, I, 11 as the only occurrence in the *Hodayoth;* 11QMelch 2, 10.

a. 11QPsᵃ 27 enumerates David's compositional and poetic works individually. Alongside 3,600 psalms (*thlym,* 27:4-5; not specified more closely; cf. *sēper hattᵉhillîm* in 4Q491 17, 4; cf. also the description of the Psalter itself as a "book of prayer and reflection"[157]), the text also mentions — separate from these psalms — various kinds of songs (altogether 450, *šyr*); none of the 364 songs for the daily burnt offering (ll. 5-6 with the verb, *lšwrr,* once) has come down to us. Of the 52 songs of the Sabbath sacrifice (l. 6), we at least have the scroll with the 13 songs for the first quarter of the year preserved in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (11QShirShabb). Although

151. E.g., *HAL,* IV, 1480b.
152. See Seidel, *Musik,* 86.
153. Ibid., 81.
154. See ibid., 85-86.
155. See Hurvitz, 58.
156. See III.2.a below.
157. Füglister, 384; see discussion above.

adduces Ps. 82:1aβb (which according to its own superscription [v. 1aα] is not a psalm of David) as an explicit statement of David *(bšyry dwyd 'šr 'mr)* asserting that the holy ones of God will be judged (l. 9) as attested by a scriptural citation "written in the songs of David *(šyry dwyd).*" Hence at the time 11QMelch was composed/copied (Herodian period/second half of the 1st century B.C.E.), the book of Psalms as a whole was viewed as an authoritative body of *šyry dwyd* and could be quoted as such. Moreover, this terminology seems to be used in such a self-evident manner here that one suspects it was based on what was already an older tradition.

In 4Q381 31, 9 *šyr wtwdh* presumably represents the positive end of a psalm of lament (ll. 4-9) exhibiting a series of parallels with Ps. 69.[161] The juxtaposition of *šîr* and *tôḏâ* (cf. Ps. 69:31[30]) suggests perhaps that the genre resembled the sacrificial songs and songs/psalms of thanksgiving (see above). 3Q6 1, 2 (fr.) describes how a song can be pleasing to God.

If the reconstruction of *šyr* in 4Q413 1, 1 is correct, it would represent one more case of parallel use, this time between *šîr* and *mizmōr,* and be subject to the corresponding interpretive possibilities regarding genre (see above). The absence of *waw* between the two terms as well as the overall wisdom context also suggests the possible presence of a construct expression *mzmr š[kl]* or something similar.

The verb probably also occurs in 4Q427 7, I, 11. The fragmentary context shows that the believers *(ydydym)* rejoice and sing *(zmr; šyr)* to God (*meleḵ* as a divine epithet; possibly the *nomen regens* of a construct expression?).

Dahmen

161. See E. M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. HSS* 28 (1986), 36, 145.

שִׁית *šîṯ*

Contents: I. 1. Forms and Distribution; 2. Early Versions; 3. Etymology; 4. Textual Considerations. II. 1. Expressions; 2. Word Field; 3. Meaning: a. Main Uses; b. Idiomatic and Original Expressions; c. Ellipsis; 4. Theological Themes. III. 1. Sirach; 2. Qumran.

šîṯ. H. J. van Dijk, "A Neglected Connotation of Three Hebrew Verbs," *VT* 18 (1968) 16-30; I. Eitan, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography* (New York, 1924); G. Garbini, "Il significato della parola ebraica ŠYT," *AANLR* 9/1 (1990) 187-91; M. Görg, "Alles hast du gelegt unter seine Füsse. Beobachtungen zu Ps 8,7b im Vergleich mit Gen 1,28," *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn. FS H. Gross. SBB* 13 ([2]1987), 125-48; W. Gross, *Bileam. Literar- und formkritische Unter-*

The absence of *śîṯ* from the late pentateuchal strata (P^G, P^S, H, Deuteronomy), in 2 Kings, Isa. 40–66, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets apart from Hosea (2:5[3]; 6:11), Prov. 1–9, the Ketubim from Canticles to 2 Chronicles, the sparse occurrences in Sirach and Qumran, and the preponderance of occurrences in the Psalms allow the cautious conclusion that the verb disappeared from common usage after the exile and was thereafter used only as a standard poetic word.[14]

2. *Early Versions.* The early versions deal with *śîṯ* much the same way they deal with *śîm.*[15] Alongside a primary rendering covering about half of all occurrences, one also encounters a broad palette of additional translations. The LXX uses 16 different roots, including *tith-* (41 times), *histan-* (8), *tass-* (7), *epiball-* (6), *didon-* (4); the Tg. 11 verbs, including *šw'* (67 times), *mn'* (4), *šr'* (3); the Pesh. 22 verbs, including *sym* (30 times), *'bd* (18), *ḥšb* (4), *'ty* (3), *rmy* (2), *yhb* (2); the Vg. 14 different roots, including *pon-* (63 times), *fac-* (2), *stat-* (2), *dirig-* (2), *-dare* (2).

3. *Etymology.* The root *śîṯ*[16] is reliably attested only in Canaanite and Akkadian (with semantic narrowing): Phoen., Pun. *št* qal, "set, place," yiphil "set up";[17] Ugar. *št,* "put, place";[18] Akk. *šêtu(m)* (Old Bab. *šiātum*), "leave over."[19] Nöldeke believes Syr. *šîyūṯā',* "appearance," is related to *śîṯ.*[20]

Other etymological derivations must remain hypothetical, including: (a) *š* causative of *'āṯâ,* a questionable derivation not least because *'āṯâ* hiphil is also attested; in any event, the OT evidence does not involve a viable *š* stem.[21]

(b) Connection with *šēṯ* I, "foundation; backside, buttocks"; although Nöldeke assumes only a distant kinship, others understand *śîṯ* as a verb denominated from *šēṯ* ("be based").[22] J. Fürst also finds a relationship with Sanskrit *sad-*, "sit," *Lat. sedere,* and Gk. *hístēmi.*[23] Based on this etymology, Garbini understands the subst. *śîṯ* as meaning "backside, buttocks," which allegedly fits Ps. 73:6 and Prov. 7:10 better than "clothing."

---

14. See also II.3.a below on Ps. 21:4(3), and II.3.b on *pānîm.* On Sirach and Qumran see III below.

15. → שׂים *śîm* (I.2).

16. On the classification as medial *y,* see Nöldeke, 41.

17. J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik. AnOr* 46 (²1970), §166; M.-J. Fuentes Estañol, *Vocabulario Fenicio* (Barcelona, 1980), 234; *DNSI,* II, 1130-31; *KAI,* III, 24; Tomback, 334-35.

18. *WUS,* no. 2702; *UT,* no. 2410; *CML²,* 159; M. J. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 371-72; D. G. Pardee, "The Preposition in Ugaritic (Part I)," *UF* 7 (1975) 372-73; *UF* 8 (1976) 271-72; also *HAL,* IV, 1484.

19. See *AHw,* III, 1221, 1252-53, on *šittu* II, "remnant."

20. Nöldeke, 41-42; *LexSyr,* 775: *qualitas.*

21. See W. Richter, *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik. ATS* 8 (1978), 58 n. 71 with bibliog.; cf. C. J. Labuschagne, "Original Shaph'el-Forms in Biblical Hebrew," *OTWSA* 10 (1967) 60.

22. Cf. Nöldeke, 42; *BLe,* §58s′. On this root, widely attested in almost all the Semitic languages, and on the discussion of this hypothesis, see *HAL,* IV, 1666-67.

23. *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT* II (Leipzig, ²1863), 430.

the underworld").[35] In Ps. 73:9 Casetti views *šattû* as problematical, though the transitive meaning does not depend on a dissociated form *(šttw),* and *šattû* has probably been constructed in accommodation to v. 28 *(šattî)* and need not necessarily be derived from *štt.*[36] In Ps. 73:18 the emendation by Dahood from *tāšîṯ lāmô* to *tišteᵉlēmô* is not at all necessary.[37] In Ps. 83:12(11) there is no need to delete the enclitic pronoun,[38] especially since a parallel with v. 14(13) may be intended. In Job 10:20, although most comms. read *šeʿēh* (following LXX) or *yišbōṯ,* the MT is probably using ellipsis; cf. *yāḏ* in v. 7.[39] The hostile context suggests understanding the *min* expression as a counterpart to the *ʿal* expression in Ps. 3:7(6). The more distant *K* also yields as cogent a sentence,[40] as does the direct *Q*. In Job 22:24 the abrupt presence of *wᵉšîṯ* has prompted the emendation *wᵉšattā;* the issues are more likely of a literary-critical nature, however.[41] In Job 38:11 scholars since Budde have generally conjectured *yišbōṯ;* the proposal in *BHS,* however, is adequate: *šîṯ bᵉ* = *obsistere.*[42]

So apart from vocalizations in individual instances, the occurrences of *šîṯ* are generally textually reliable. Textual criticism has also made an additional occurrence probable, namely, Hos. 9:13 (after LXX: *lēṣayiḏ šāṯ lô bānāyw,* "[Ephraim] has made his children his wild game").[43]

II. 1. *Expressions.* For the verb *šîṯ,* forms and situations of the imperfect slightly predominate (31 times; pf. consec. 2 times) over those of the perfect (18 times; impf. consec. 10 times). These are joined by 21 occurrences of appellative forms (impvs., 12 times; jussives, 2; cohortatives, 3; vetitives, 4). The infinitive construct occurs twice (Ex. 10:1; Job 30:1), the infinitive absolute once (Isa. 22:7). The subject of *šîṯ* is always animate; in 45 occurrences it is human beings, in 39 divine beings, and once an animal (Ps. 84:4[3]). Additional syntagmas include a direct (affected [as opposed to effected]) object: parts of the body or another anthropological expression, 20 times; persons, 18; inanimate objects, 12; animals, 3; nature, 3; abstractions or circumstances, 20; *ʾeṯ* is

---

35. Cf. *GK,* §144; Herkenne, *Die Heilige Schrift des ATs. HSAT* (1923-59), V/2, 183; Deissler, *Die Psalmen. Welt der Bibel. Kleinkommentare zur Heiligen Schrift* (Düsseldorf, ²1977), 199.

36. Cf. Casetti, *Gibt,* 118 n. 186; H. Irsigler, *Psalm 73. Monolog eines Weisen. Text, Programm, Struktur. ATS* 20 (1984), 23.

37. Cf. Irsigler, *Psalm 73,* 37-38; Dahood, *Psalms 51–100. AB* 17 (1968), 192; already in "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography II," *Bibl* 45 (1964) 408.

38. See *HAL,* IV, 1486a; *GK,* §131o.

39. Additional suggestions in *BDB,* 1011.

40. See the rendering in TOB.

41. See G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 351. For the emendation see still *BHS;* cf. already *GesB,* 824.

42. So also O. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob. FRLANT* 121 (1978), 55-56 n. 196; *HAL,* IV, 1486a; contra the proposal in A. C. M. Blommerde, *Northwest Semitic Grammar and Job. BietOr* 22 (1969), 133; cf. M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* 15 (1965), 294. On Budde's conjecture see Fohrer, *Hiob,* 491.

43. See H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 160-61; additional proposals in *HAL,* IV, 1485-86.

pressions with *šîṯ* to specify more closely the meaning: "mental activity" (*yd'*, Prov. 27:23; *bḥn*, Job 7:17-18; *pqd*, Job 7:17-18; *spr*, Ps. 48:13-14[12-13]; *šm'*, Ex. 7:22-23; Prov. 22:17; *r'h*, Nu. 24:1-2; Prov. 24:32; connotation "pay attention to"), "answer" (*'nh*, 1 S. 4:20; negatively: *ḥrš* hiphil, 2 S. 13:20), "act of destruction" (*šammâ*, Jer. 50:3), "trust" (*bṭḥ*, Ps. 62:11[10]; connotation "put, place upon"; cf. Ps. 73:28), "make feel uncertain" (*npl* hiphil, Ps. 73:18), "assess" (negatively: *m's*, Job 30:1). The contextual meaning can emerge in individual instances from an adjacent clause with a negation and an antonymous verb (cf. Job 38:11; Isa. 5:6).[51]

3. *Meaning*. a. *Main Uses*. Like its most important synonyms *śîm* and *ntn*,[52] *šîṯ* is a semantically malleable term and consequently also semantically vague, something coming to expression not only in the widely varying renderings in the early versions, but also in the broadly drawn lists of meanings in the various lexicons. A determination of the inner-Hebrew meaning of *šîṯ* must proceed according to the same principles as is the case with *śîm*, a procedure ultimately demonstrating that many of the previously mentioned textual problems are essentially translation problems, ending with an acknowledgment of the complete semantic equivalence between *śîm* and *šîṯ*.[53] Differences emerge at the stylistic and especially the historical level.[54]

Like *śîm*, so also *šîṯ* is basically a threefold term with a primarily locative semantic effect. The threefold character emerges from the plethora of occurrences with a subject, direct object, and an additional syntagma (80 occurrences = 94%). The locative semantic effect emerges from the second dependent syntagma, which in the overwhelming number of cases is a prepositional object with a locative connotation (54 times = 64%, including 17 times the prep. *'al*, 12 times *b*ᵉ, 12 times *l*ᵉ [Ps. 21:4[3]; 132:11 attest a locative semantic effect for *l*ᵉ in the sense of "on, upon"[55]]).

The main uses of *šîṯ* can be organized as follows:

(1) locative: 30 times ("lay, put, place"; e.g., Gen. 48:14);

(2) mental-figurative: 16 times ("direct [attention] toward"; e.g., Ex. 7:23);

(3) factitive: 18 times ("make [into something]"; e.g., Jer. 2:15);

(4) factitive-figurative: 3 times ("appoint, install"; Gen. 41:33; 1 K. 11:34; Ps. 45:17[16]);

(5) special meanings: 8 times ("place upon, impose": Ex. 21:22,30[bis]; "set, fix": Ex. 23:31; Job 14:13; "esteem, consider": 2 S. 19:29[28]; Job 30:1; Jer. 3:19).

An exact classification cannot be made for about 10 passages. One striking feature

---

51. On additional connotations cf. van Dijk; J. Hoftijzer, "Deux vases à inscription identique," *VT* 13 (1963) 338-39; contra an assumption of the meaning "write" (e.g., M. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology. BietOr* 17 [1965], 73); cf. D. G. Pardee, *UF* 8 (1976) 271 (with bibliog.).

52. See C. Siegfried and B. Stade, *Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1893), 792-93; → נתן *nāṯan* (II.2), X, 93; Schreiner, 311.

53. → שׂים *śîm* (II.3). On textual problems see I.4 above.

54. See I.1 above.

55. See M. Dahood, *Psalms 101–150. AB* 17A (1970), 246, concerning the version of 11QPsᵃ 6: 7.

is the higher than average occurrence of a divine subject with the primary meanings "set, fix" and "make." In any event, God is the most frequent subject that "sets, puts, places" (36 times = 42%).

b. *Idiomatic and Original Expressions.* The term *šîṯ* is used in idiomatic expressions that overwhelmingly include words for parts of the body and anthropological expressions:

lēḇ/lēḇāḇ:[56] Expressions include those with *šîṯ + ('eṯ) lēḇ* (enclitic pronoun) + (prepositional phrase) with a figurative meaning in the sense of focusing one's heart on a person or thing (never with *'al;*[57] with *l^e*: Ex. 7:23;[58] 2 S. 13:20 ["pay no attention to"]; Jer. 31:21 ["note well, commit to memory"]; Ps. 48:14[13]: "consider well"' cf. v. 13[12]: "count"; H. Spieckermann identifies the occasion as an inspection, not a processional, J. Scharbert as an "open house during the time of Josiah"[59]); Prov. 22:17 ["attention"]; 27:23 ["attention, care"]; without a prepositional phrase: 1 S. 4:20; Ps. 62:11[10] ["setting hopes" on wealth leads a person away from God]; Prov. 24:32 [par. *lqḥ mûsār;* Delitzsch: "attention and reflection"[60]]; theological: with *'el:* Job 7:17 (God setting his mind on human beings, a bitter parody of Ps. 8:5[4]: *mâ-'^enôš;* cf. Ps. 144:3 and the comms.]). Considering the analogously constructed expression with *b^e + qereḇ* (Prov. 26:24), the expression *šîṯ + b^e + nepeš* par. *lēḇāḇ* (+ reflexive enclitic pronoun) + abstraction (Ps. 13:3[2]) may be based on a fixed notion, though the meaning is still ambivalent (moreover, one can probably not determine whether in Ps. 13:3[2] the verb is also affecting the *yāḡôn* expression or whether the reference is rather to circumstances[61]): "put into"[62] (cf. the expression *śîm + b^e + lēḇāḇ* in 1 S. 21:13[12]; Job 22:22) or "consider; seek advice"[63] (additional support from similar expressions using *'ēṣâ* with *yhb, bw'* hiphil, *'śh,*[64] and the *en* of the LXX; in that case it would be an example of nominalization[65]).

rō'š: Concerning the expression *šîṯ + yāmîn* + enclitic pronoun + *'al-rō'š* (Gen. 48:14,17) in reference to a gesture accompanying a blessing, and concerning the expression *šîṯ* + head adornment + *l^erō'š* (theological: Ps. 21:4[3]) in reference to the transferal of insignia accompanying a person's installation in an office, see the expressions with *śîm.*[66]

---

56. → שׂים *śîm* (II.2.c).

57. See II.3.a above.

58. See E. Dhorme, *L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en Hébreu et en Akkadien* (1923; repr. Paris, 1963), 124-25.

59. H. Spieckermann, "Stadtgott und Gottesstadt," *Bibl* 73 (1992) 22; J. Scharbert, "Das historische Umfeld von Psalm 48," *Ein Gott, eine Offenbarung. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese, Theologie und Spiritualität. FS N. Füglister* (Würzburg, 1991), 305.

60. *KD,* in loc.

61. See M. Weiss, *The Bible from Within* (Jerusalem, 1984), 304-5 n. 10.

62. J. Fürst, *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT* (Leipzig, ²1863), II, 430.

63. See *KD,* in loc., with reference to Prov. 26:24; *BDB,* 1011.

64. *BDB,* 420.

65. → שׂים *śîm* II.3.f.

66. → שׂים *śîm* II.3.c.

in which *kap* + *ʿal* + person is used in this sense exhibits negative character: Job 13:21 *(rḥq* hiphil + *mēʿal);* 40:32 (*śîm* + *ʿal;* A. Dillmann interprets as a "laying on of hands in a hostile sense"[78]). For a cross-check, cf. Ex. 33:22 (*śkk;* with no actual contact; moreover, in the dual[79]). The psalmist in Ps. 139:5 perceives the divine laying on of the hand "more as a burden than as liberation."[80]

šᵉḵem: The expression *šîṯ* + person + *šᵉḵem* (occurring only in Ps. 21:13[12]) is usually viewed as a variant of *ntn/pnh* + person + *ʿōrep* in the sense of "put to flight."[81] In that case, however, the imagery of the two verse halves is rather incongruous. The rendering in TOB seems plausible, namely, "for you will place them upon the back."[82]

regel: One symbol of subjugation comes to expression in two different expressions using *šîṯ* with *regel.*[83] God promises to make the king's enemies into his footstool (*hᵃḏōm lᵉragleyḵā;* Ps. 110:1).[84] He similarly puts "all things *(kōl)* under their [human beings'] feet *(taḥaṯ raglāyw)*" (Ps. 8:7[6]). Görg adduces comparisons with Egyptian and biblical imagery and texts in demonstrating the singular character of Ps. 8 (and Gen. 1:28) in the sense of a distancing from the notion of human rule over other human beings (differently in Ps. 47:4[3]; 110:1).[85]

ḥōq: The theological expression *šîṯ* + *ḥōq* + person (occurring only in Job 14:13) uses *ḥōq* in the sense of "time."[86] The reference, however, is less to a person's "limited life span"[87] than to the end of divine wrath. By way of allusion to Gen. 8:1 *(zkr),* the underworld may possibly be understood here as a protective arch.[88]

ʾôṯ: The juxtaposition of divine *šîṯ* and *śîm* + *ʾōṯōṯay* in Ex. 10:1-2 derives from the change in clausal structure corresponding to a change in use. The expression with *šîṯ* refers to "placing signs visibly among them *(bᵉqirbô),*" while the fixed formula with *śîm* refers to "performing signs among them."[89]

kōp̄er: A *kōp̄er* sum is imposed in Ex. 21:30 (*šîṯ* qal pass.).[90]

---

77. In order: *GesB,* 824 (so also S. Wagner, "Zur Theologie des Psalms 139," *Congress Volume, Göttingen 1977. SVT* 29 [1978], 361); *KD,* in loc.; Dahood, *Psalms 101–150,* 288.

78. A. Dillmann, *Hiob. KEHAT* II (^{3}1869), 360.

79. See *HAL,* II, 492a; III, 1328.

80. Wagner, "Zur Theologie," 361.

81. → ערף *ʿōrep,* XI, 367; cf. *HAL,* IV, 1495a.

82. See already *LexHebAram,* 843; similarly Dahood, *Psalms 1–50,* 134; a different view is taken by E. Zenger, *Mit meinem Gott überspringe ich Mauern. Einführung in das Psalmenbuch* (Freiburg im Breisgau, ^{2}1988), 165.

83. → רגל *regel* (III.3).

84. → הדם *hᵃḏōm (hᵃdhōm),* III, 325-26, 334; ישׁב *yāšaḇ,* VI, 431; → רגל *regel* (II.1); cf. Dhorme, *L'emploi,* 158.

85. Görg, 137-38, 147-48.

86. *BDB,* 349b.

87. G. Liedke, "חקק *ḥqq* to inscribe, prescribe," *TLOT,* II, 471.

88. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 258.

89. For the former see C. Siegfried and B. Stade, *Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum AT,* 792; similarly TOB, albeit also for v. 2. For the latter → שׂים *śîm* (II.3.c s.v. *ʾôṯ*).

90. Cf. A. Schenker, *Text und Sinn im AT. Textgeschichtliche und Bibeltheologische Studien. OBO* 103 (1991), 120-25 = *Bibl* 63 (1982) 32-37; and B. Lang, → כפר *kipper,* 301.

k^e) he once did during the period of the judges (Ps. 83:12[11]; *šîṯ* + k^e + PN) and make them like whirling dust and chaff *(kaggalgal k^eqaš).*[108]

Hos. 6:11, a textually difficult and probably secondary passage, adopts the word "harvest" *(qāṣîr)* from the repertoire of oracles of judgment and then reinterprets it as a salvific term.[109] The Isaiah apocalypse uses an innovative metaphor in the hymn to the strong *(ʿōz)* city Jerusalem.[110] In Isa. 26:1 Yahweh (self-evident subject) sets up "salvation/victory" *(yešûʿâ)* "like walls and bulwarks" (a consideration of the sequence of syntagmas [affected object + effected object] requires this translation[111]).

III. 1. *Sirach.* Sirach uses *šîṯ* qal in 6 passages (10:5; 15:14; 38:17,26; marginal reading in 34[31]:14; 38:20; not counting the fragmentary *št* in the Masada ms.: 42:6). The LXX twice uses *didon-* and once each *tith-* and *poie-*. Parallel terms include *ntn* (15:14), *zkr* (38:20). Idiomatic expressions include *šîṯ yāḏ* (34[31]:14: "reach out"?); *šîṯ beyāḏ* (15:14: "deliver over"); *šîṯ lēḇ* (with *ʾel,* 38:20 ["give one's heart over to"]; infinitive group: 38:26 ["set one's heart on doing something"]). Sir. 38:17 *(šîṯ ʾēḇel)* represents a variant of *ʿśh ʾēḇel* (Gen. 50:10; Jer. 6:26; Ezk. 24:17; Mic. 1:8). The term is used theologically only twice. Sir. 15:14 (Hebrew text) adds a preceding doublet to the statement also attested in the LXX that at the beginning the creator left human beings over to their own responsibility (*yṣr;* cf. J. Haspecker:[112] synonym with "heart," "not a one-sidedly evil inclination"), namely, that he delivered them over to their destroyer *(ḥwtp).* According to the widespread OT notion that "a king's *hôḏ* is a gift of Yahweh's own dignity,"[113] 10:5 God puts his dignity before the lawgiver *(wlpny mḥwqq yšyt hwdw).* Considering that in the MT *hôḏ* is often used with *ʿal,* especially with synonyms of *šîṯ* (*ntn,* Nu. 27:20; Ps. 8:2[1]; Dnl. 11:21; 1 Ch. 29:25; *šwh,* Ps. 21:6[5]), M. Dahood's proposal seems increasingly plausible according to which *šyt l* here means "to put upon," particularly since *šîṯ* is also attested in this usage in Ps. 21:4(3); 132:11.[114] The LXX also seems to understand the Hebrew text thus, rendering *prosṓpǭ . . . epithḗsei.*

2. *Qumran.* The term *šîṯ* has thus far appeared only 3 times reliably in the Qumran texts (11QT 54:19, apart from the opening conjunction, cites Dt. 13:7 verbatim, which is why *yšytkh* can also derive only from *šyt*). According to a statement in the Commu-

---

108. See Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* in loc.; Schreiner, 325. → שׂים *śîm* (II.4).

109. See Wolff, *Hosea,* 122-23; J. Hausmann, → קצר *qāṣar* (III), XIII, 103. On the textual difficulty see I.4 above.

110. → עיר *ʿîr* (IV.5), XI, 64-65.

111. See already A. Knobel, *Der Prophet Jesaja. KEHAT* V (⁴1898), 220-21; *KD,* in loc. (with supporting arguments); *LexHebAram,* 839: "salutem facit moenia = facit ut salus nobis sit idem quod urbi moenia"; a different view in Vanoni, 199 n. 726, with most comms. and translations (cf. EÜ; TOB).

112. *Gottesfurcht bei Jesus Sirach. Ihre Religiöse Struktur und ihre literarische und doktrinäre Bedeutung. AnBibl* 30 (1967), 145 n. 46.

113. See D. Vetter, "הוֹד *hôd* highness, majesty," *TLOT,* I, 356.

114. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography XI," *Bibl* 54 (1973) 357. See II.3.a above.

I. 1. *Etymology, Distribution.* The Hebrew root *škb* occurs in all the Semitic languages: Akk. *sakāpu(m)* II, "lie down to rest"; Phoen. and Pun. *škb;* Ugar. *škb;* Jewish Aram. *šᵉḵaḇ, šᵉḵîḇ, ma-/miškᵉḇā';* Biblical Aram. *miškaḇ;* Eth. *sakaba* and *sakba.*[1] Some authors distinguish two homonymous roots for Hebrew: I, "lie down," and II, "pour out" (cf. Arab. *sakaba* IV).[2] The second root would provide the basis for the expression *šiḵbaṯ zera',* "spilling/pouring out of seed" (see below), and because of its semantic proximity to *škb* I in the meaning "lie down, sleep with,"[3] allegedly fused with that root. The homonymity would then live on as an ambiguous wordplay in Job 38:37: "Or who can pour out/tilt [*yaškîḇ,* lit. 'lay'] the waterskins of the heavens?"[4] Because West Semitic attests no other examples of two homonymous roots, this etymological distinction must be abandoned, and the expression *šiḵbaṯ zera'* is thus to be explained as a unique semantic development (actually "acc. cogn. c. שׁכב";[5] Nu. 5:13; Lev. 15:17,18; 19:20); it occurs as the subject with other verbs in Lev. 15:16,17,32; 22:4; cf. also Ex. 16:13-14: "In the morning there was a layer of dew *(šiḵbaṯ haṭṭāl)* around the camp."

2. *OT Evidence.* The vb. *škb* occurs 212 times in the Hebrew OT, including 198 times in the qal, 2 in the niphal, 8 in the hiphil, 3 in the hophal, 1 in the pual.[6] The most important noun, *miškāḇ (nomen [loci] actionis),* occurs 46 times.[7] In the Aramaic portion of the OT, the verb does not occur at all, while the noun *miškaḇ* occurs 6 times in Daniel. The other two substantives, *šᵉḵāḇâ** (or *šiḵbâ**[8]) and *šᵉḵōḇeṯ,* occur 9 (always P) and 4 times, respectively, the former as the subject or internal object of the vb. *škb,* the latter always as the object of *ntn* (whence the classification as *nomina actionis* with an intransitive or transitive meaning[9]).

The verb clearly occurs more often in prose genres, including 62 times in the Penta-

---

und Tod im Koran," *Kairos* 19 (1977) 116-23; J. G. S. S. Thomson, "Sleep: An Aspect of Jewish Anthropology," *VT* 5 (1955) 421-33; N. J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the OT. BietOr* 21 (1969); E. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry. Sather Classical Lectures* 46 (Berkeley, 1979); L. Wächter, *Der Tod im AT. AzT* II/8 (1967).

1. See *HAL,* II, 646b; IV, 1486-88; *AHw,* II, 1011; *DNSI,* II, 1132; *KAI* III, 24; Tomback, 316; *UT,* no. 2411; *WUS,* no. 2603; *CML²,* 158; Jastrow, 854, 1570-71; *ChW,* II, 77, 478; *NH,* 257, 423; Beyer, 707; Kuhn, 135, 220; *LexLingAram,* 108; *LexLingAeth,* 380.
2. *GesB,* 824-25; König, 498; *LexHebAram,* 840; Orlinsky, 37-39; Barr, *CPT,* 137 (cf. 336), does not commit.
3. See II.3 below.
4. *KD,* in loc.; R. Gordis, *The Book of Job* (New York, 1978), 453: an example of *talḥin.*
5. *BDB,* 1012.
6. *BDB,* 1011; Even-Shoshan, 1140-41. Andersen and Forbes, 42, 245, 433, 458, do not include the two niphal occurrences (Isa. 13:16; Zech. 14:2) and the pual occurrence (Jer. 3:2), preferring to read *K* instead of *Q.*
7. *BDB,* 1012; Even-Shoshan, 718; 42 times according to Andersen and Forbes, 159, 368, who do not count Ps. 149:5; Isa. 57:2; Hos. 7:14; Mic. 2:1.
8. Orlinsky, 39.
9. König, 498.

30:17; Eccl. 2:23). The person always needs an appropriate place: a definite "place" (*māqôm:* 1 S. 3:2), possibly even in the "temple" (*hêḵāl:* 1 S. 3:3,9), a "house" (*bayiṯ:* Josh. 2:1,8; 2 S. 4:5), a "chamber" (*ʿᵃlîyâ:* 2 K. 4:11), an "encampment" (*maʿgāl:* 1 S. 26:5,7), at the "entrance of the king's house" (*peṯaḥ bêṯ hammeleḵ:* 2 S. 11:9,13), or the "hold of the ship" (*yarkᵉṯê hassᵉpînâ:* Jon. 1:5). There is occasionally a "bed" (*miṭṭâ:* 2 S. 4:7), which one may not pledge (Prov. 22:27: *miškāḇ*), though several "stones" can also suffice (*ʾᵃḇānîm:* Gen. 28:11). Normally a person first "eats" (*ʾkl:* Gen. 19:3-4; Lev. 14:47; 1 K. 19:6; Ruth 3:3-4,7) and "drinks" (*šth:* 1 K. 19:6; Ruth 3:3-4,7). When two persons sleep together, the one warms *(ḥmm)* the other (Eccl. 4:11), just as "a young virgin" does (1 K. 1:2); the prophet Elisha similarly symbolically lies down on a dead child in order to give back to the child the warmth of life (2 K. 4:34). In any event, every person has the right to sleep under the cover of his "cloak" (*śimlâ:* Ex. 22:26[27]; Dt. 24:13). When these conditions have been taken care of, the act of "lying down" *(šāḵaḇ)* is followed by actual "sleeping" (*yšn/šēnâ:* Gen. 28:11-16; 1 S. 26:7; 1 K. 19:5; Ps. 3:6[5]; 4:9[8]; Prov. 3:24; 6:9-10; 24:33), "sleeping soundly" (*rdm:* Jon. 1:5), and "slumbering" (*tᵉnûmâ:* Prov. 6:10; 24:33). In some cases, however, there is "restiveness" (*nᵉḏuḏîm:* Job 7:4), or a person's mind does not come to rest (*lōʾ-škb lēḇ:* Eccl. 2:23). In general, however, a person hopes for "safety" (*beṭaḥ:* Job 11:18; Hos. 2:20[18]) and "peace" (*šālôm:* Lev. 26:6; Ps. 4:9[8]) away from the enemy ("lion": Ps. 57:5[4]) so that no one may frighten the person sleeping (*ḥrd:* Lev. 26:6; Job 11:19; Ruth 3:8; *pḥd:* Prov. 3:24) and so that one's possessions are still there in the morning (Job 27:19); the commandments of one's parent's watch over the sleeping person (*šmr:* Prov. 6:22). Sleep comes to an end because of the necessity to work (1 S. 3:15), for only the "lazybones" (*ʿāṣēl:* Prov. 6:9-10; 24:30-33) sleeps so long that poverty catches up with him.

The noun *miškāḇ* also functions within the semantic field of human sleep (20 times plus 6 times in the Aramaic of Daniel). It can refer in a purely objective fashion to a "bed" (Ex. 7:28; 2 S. 4:7,11; 11:2; 17:28; Prov. 22:27; in legal language: Lev. 15:4-5,21,23-24,26) or "couch" (2 S. 11:13). As will be seen, it also became a specialized reference to certain kinds of sleep,[15] something already applying in a limited fashion to the "midday nap" (*miškāḇ haṣṣohᵒrāyim:* 2 S. 4:5). Depending on the context, however, the word can also express various qualifications regarding the entire semantic spectrum of sleep. The bed is the place where a person is thrown back upon himself, the place where "dreams" *(ḥᵃlōmôṯ)* and "visions" *(ḥezyōnôṯ)* can torment him (Job 7:13-14; 33:15), where he can also secretly devise wickedness and evil deeds *(ḥāšaḇ ʾāwen)*[16] (Mic. 2:1; antithesis: "when the morning dawns"; Ps. 36:5). Yet neither should one overestimate the security represented by this place; i.e., a person should be careful what he says and not speak derisively[17] about the powerful, for the danger of being denounced is present precisely when a person feels most secure (Eccl. 10:20:

15. See McAlpine, 48.
16. → און *ʾāwen (ʾāven)* (III.3), I, 144-47.
17. → קלל *qll* (III.1).

"bedroom" par. "thoughts"[18]). The prophet sent by God similarly informs the king about that which his enemy speaks in his "bedchamber" (2 K. 6:12).

3. *Sexual Intercourse.* Although *škb* is used to mean "sleep with someone, have sexual intercourse with someone," almost as often (55 times)[19] as it does to mean simply "sleep," these occurrences are limited to quite specific literary genres (laws: Ex. 22:15,18[16,19]; Lev. 15:18,24[bis],33; 18:22; 19:20; 20:11,12,13,18,20; Nu. 5:13,19; Dt. 22:22[bis],23,25[bis],28,29; imprecations: Dt. 27:20,21,22,23), stories of abnormal sexual behavior (Gen. 19:32,33[bis],34[bis],35[bis]; 26:10; 35:22; 39:7,10,12,14; 1 S. 2:22; 2 S. 11:4; Jer. 3:2; Ezk. 23:8) or abomination (Gen. 34:2,7; 2 S. 12:11; 13:11,14), and several announcements of judgment (Dt. 28:30; Isa. 13:16; Zech. 14:2). Although it is rarely used in stories to refer to appropriate sexual behavior (Gen. 30:15,16; 2 S. 11:11; 12:24), these latter texts do clearly show that in and of itself the expression refers in a neutral fashion merely to the act of sexual intercourse, something confirmed by its use in legal regulations. First, it can function as a *terminus comparationis* between permitted and forbidden sexual practices, for example, "You shall not lie with a male as with a woman" (Lev. 18:22; 20:13; both times *škb* bis). Second, it is always something in the personal circumstances of one or both of the involved parties that makes the act of such "lying" morally or ritually reproachable, e.g., Ex. 22:15(16); Dt. 22:28,29: an unbetrothed girl; Ex. 22:18(19): an animal; Lev. 15:24,33: an unclean woman; Lev. 19:20: a female slave designated as a secondary wife; Lev. 20:11,12,20; Dt. 27:20-23: wives of relatives; Nu. 5:13,19; Dt. 22:22: a married woman; Dt. 22:23,25: a betrothed girl.

The two relational words *'ēṯ* and *'im* are used with *škb* with this meaning (20 and 27 times, respectively). An historical rather than a semantic distinction seems to obtain here in that P prefers *'im,* D *'ēṯ.*[20] Suffix forms vocalized as *'ōṯ-* must be referred back to the preposition, not to a *nota accusativi.*[21] Only in one instance (Gen. 39:10) is the relational word *'ēṣel,* "next to," used.[22]

Although the noun *miškāḇ* can also be used in sexual contexts together with the verb (twice: Lev. 18:22; 20:13), it functions independently far more often (12 times). Here the same considerations apply as do for the verb, namely, that it can have a neutral sense (Nu. 31:17,18,35; Jgs. 21:11,12: "every woman that has [not] lain with a male") and can also refer both to appropriate (Cant. 3:1: "Upon my *bed* at night I sought him [*bqš*] whom my soul loves [*'hb*]") and sinful sexual intercourse (Gen. 49:4: "because you went up onto your father's *bed;* then you defiled it [*ḥll*]"; Isa. 57:7,8[bis]: "Upon a high and lofty mountain you have set your *bed . . . for, in deserting me, you have uncovered your bed,* you have gone up to it, and you have made it wide; and you have made a bargain for yourself with them, you have loved their *bed*"; Ezk. 23:17: "And the Baby-

18. See N. Lohfink, *Kohelet. NEB* (1980), 78-79.
19. McAlpine, 44.
20. See Orlinsky, 19-22.
21. See ibid., 23-27.
22. Concerning the interpretation see ibid., 34-36.

The text of Prov. 23:34 is problematical ("You will be like one who lies down in the midst of the sea, like one who falls asleep at the ship's wheel").[40] In any case, the author seems to be comparing the dizziness characterizing those who lie around drunk with the rolling of a ship.

d. *Animals.* The term *škb* is often said of animals in comparisons with human beings. The word's inherent ambivalence emerges in these contexts as well.[41] Under God's guidance, Israel advances with firm resolve on the land "rousing itself like a lion; it does not lie down until it has eaten the prey" (Nu. 23:24). In its secure land, Israel is like a lion: "He crouched, he lay down like a lion, and like a lioness; who will rouse him up?" (Nu. 24:9). By contrast, the leaders of the people are "all silent dogs that cannot bark; dreaming, lying down loving to slumber" (Isa. 56:10).

Although Nathan's parable about the poor man and his "little ewe lamb" articulates in a radical fashion the social relationship between human beings and animals (2 S. 12:3: "it used to eat of his meager fare, and drink from his cup, and lie in his bosom, and it was like a daughter to him"), it is doubtful that one can adduce such a literary genre as a source of information concerning the biblical author's understanding of nature.[42]

The book of Job apparently uses *škb* to describe quite directly the way the hippopotamus dwells in its natural environment (Job 40:21: "Under the lotus plants it lies, in the covert of the reeds and in the marsh"). The mixed scientific and mythical description of this animal (vv. 15-24), however, serves as a didactic metaphor for Job himself (v. 15: "Look at Behemoth, which I made just as I made you" [cf. 12:7-8]; v. 19: "it is the first of the great acts of God"). Since the Almighty has given Behemoth the shady swamp as cover, Job can be assured that the darkness into which God has brought him (30:26; cf. 12:22-25) will similarly protect him; cf. v. 23: "Even if the river is turbulent, it is not frightened; it is confident though Jordan rushes against its mouth."[43] In this animal comparison, *škb* acquires the special meaning "live confidently under God's protection."

6. *Special Passages.* In Ps. 68:14(13), an extraordinarily difficult text, *škb* may have a succinct theological connotation if one can translate "If you (also) lie among the saddlebags, the wings of a dove are (nonetheless) covered with silver."[44] In that case the verse would be saying that no sooner has Yahweh issued his mighty word than a host of messengers of joy, "doves" according to an ancient Near Eastern notion, appear. Although Israel responds passively to God's word here ("lie down [*škb*] between the saddlebags," an allusion to Reuben's behavior according to Jgs. 5:16), victory is sure with

---

40. Cf. H. Ringgren,*Sprüche. ATD* XVI/1 ([3]1980), 96; W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 248, 394ff.; O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 261, 264, 278.

41. See II.1, 2, 3.b.

42. So R. Bartelmus, "Die Tierwelt in der Bibel. Exegetische Beobachtungen zu einem Teilaspekt der Diskussion um eine Theologie der Natur," *BN* 37 (1987) 21, contra M.-L. Henry, *Das Tier im religiösen Bewusstsein des alttestamentlichen Menschen. SGV* 220/221 (1958), 11.

43. See J. G. Gammie, "Behemoth and Leviathan: On the Didactic and Theological Significance of Job 40:15–41:26," *Israelite Wisdom. FS S. Terrien* (Missoula, Mont., 1978) 217-31.

44. See O. Keel, *Vögel als Boten. Studien zu Ps 68,12-14, Gen 8,6-12, Koh 10,20 und dem Aussenden von Botenvögeln in Ägypten. OBO* 14 (1977), 12-36.

12:1; 1QSa 1:10; 6Q15 5, 2, 3). It means "be dead" in 1QH 6:34: "you who lie in the dust . . . raise up an ensign" (the words *wškwby ʿpr* apparently constitute a link between Isa. 26:19 [*šōḵᵉnê ʿāpār*] and Dnl. 12:22 [*rabbîm mîyᵉšēnê ʾaḏmaṯ-ʿāpār*] based on the idiom *škb leʿāpār* or *ʿal-ʿāpār* occurring in Job [7:21; 20:11; 21:26]). The expression "lie down with one's ancestors" occurs in 4Q509 5-6, 7 *(hnkh škwb ʿm ʾbwtyhm).* Finally, the Copper Scroll (3Q15 11, 16) mentions the west entry of a *byt hmškb,* "*triclinium*"/dining-room(?).[52]

3. *Targums.* The Targums develop the meaning "sleep in death" beyond its OT usage.[53] First, *škb* replaces other verbs (e.g., *mwt* in Tg. Ps.-J. Dt. 4:22; 32:50; 34:7). Second, the expression "lie down with one's ancestors" appears not only in the same passages and with the same form as in the Hebrew text (Tg. Onq., Ps.-J. Gen. 47:30; Tg. Onq. Dt. 31:16), but also in the new expression "sleep in the dust with one's ancestors" (Tg. Ps.-J. Dt. 31:16: *ʾant šᵉḵiḇ bᵉʿaprāʾ ʿim ʾaḇāṯāḵ;* cf. the discussion of Qumran above). Third, a new word for a dead person appears, *šāḵēḇ* (Tg. Ps.-J. Nu. 19:11,13; Dt. 25:5; Tg. Ruth 1:8; Tg. Ps. 31:13; Tg. Eccl. 4:2). Finally, one might mention one case of reinterpretation. In Isa. 49:8 the targumist changes the commissioning of the Servant from "establish the land" *(lᵉhāqîm ʾereṣ)* to "establish the righteous who lie in the dust" *(laʾᵃqāmāʾ ṣaddîqayyāʾ dᵉšāḵḇîn bᵉʿaprāʾ).*

Beuken

52. See J. T. Milik, *DJD,* III, 248-49, 272.
53. See Rodríguez Carmona, 130-33.

שָׁכַח *šāḵaḥ*

Contents: I. Surroundings, Word Field, LXX, Qumran. II. Human Forgetting: 1. Interpersonal Relations; 2. Forgetting God. III. God (Not) Forgetting. IV. Semantic Field. V. The "Land of Forgetfulness."

šāḵaḥ. M. Berger, "Das Vergessen im AT" (diss., Leipzig, 1968); F. García López, "Deut. VI et la Tradition-Rédaction du Deutéronome," *RB* 86 (1979) 59-91, esp. 59-64; O. Haggenmüller, "Erinnern und Vergessen Gottes und der Menschen," *BiLe* 3 (1962) 1-15, 75-89, 193-201; Y. Harari, "De verbis *škḥ, zkr, yšn* et expergefactione versus Deum," *BethM* 22 (1977) 385; J. J. M. Roberts, "*niškaḥtî . . . millēb,* Ps. XXXI 13," *VT* 25 (1975) 797-801; W. Schottroff, "שׁכח *škḥ* to forget," *TLOT,* III, 1322-26.

forgot Joseph (Gen. 40:23) and with the forgetting both of the ancestors' as well as one's own crimes (Jer. 44:9).

2. *Forgetting God.* Many of the texts that refer to purely human forgetting in connection with interpersonal relations, as already pointed out, themselves stand in theological contexts. According to the numerous texts addressing the issue, people do not forget Yahweh/God unconsciously or because of the inevitable march of time, but rather through a willful, culpable act and from conscious disinclination and renunciation. Such forgetting accordingly prompts Yahweh's corresponding punishment (Hos. 4:6). It is first especially Hosea, and then Jeremiah, Deuteronomy, and the Dtr literature that speak of how the people of Israel as a whole incur guilt by forgetting Yahweh. Not surprisingly, then, *škḥ* occurs frequently in prophetic laments (Hos. 2:15[13]; 4:6; 8:14; 13:6; Jer. 2:32b; 13:25; 18:15a; 20:11; 23:27,40; cf. also Isa. 17:10; 51:13; Ezk. 22:12; 23;35; Isa. 65:11), in Dtn/Dtr admonitions ("forget not") or critical historical retrospectives according to which Israel should not have forgotten Yahweh and his will, his acts in history on behalf of his people, but did so nonetheless and now must experience his punishment or indeed already has experienced it (Dt. 4:9,23; 6:12; 8:11,14; 9:7; 25:19; 32:18; Jgs. 3:7; 1 S. 1:11; 12:9; 2 K. 17:38); finally, *škḥ* occurs in the influence these texts exerted later on several psalms (Ps. 50:22; 78:7,11; 106:13,21).

Jer. 3:21 recounts how the people of Israel forgot Yahweh by perverting their ways and worshiping at the high places, prompting the following admonition and penitential liturgy (v. 22a; 3:22b–4:2). Indeed, such punishment can even consist in the guilty parties themselves being forgotten (Jer. 30:14; cf. Job 19:14; 24:20), something Yahweh himself, of course, brings about (Lam. 2:6) such that the prophet can anticipate it in the form of a divine self-statement (Hos. 4:6). Here too the antithesis of forgetting Yahweh is "remembering, being mindful of" (Dt. 5:15; 7:18; 8:2,18; 9:27; 15:15; 16:3,12; 24:18,22) or "knowing (him)" (*yd'*, Hos. 2:15,22[13,20]; 4:6; 13:4-6; cf. 2:10[8]). These admonitions should be "unforgettable," i.e., "not forgotten" (niphal; Dt. 31:21, Dtr). References to the forgetting of Yahweh's former salvific deeds on behalf of his people (Dt. 4:9; 6:12; 8:14; Ps. 78:7,11; 106:13; cf. 59:12[11]) as well as to the forgetting of present circumstances brought about by Yahweh's deeds (Ps. 50:22; Isa. 51:13) are largely found in Dtr historical interpretations. The subject of such forgetting here is accordingly the people more frequently than the individual.

The people end up forgetting Yahweh because, concretely, they apostatize to other gods (Dt. 8:19; Jer. 23:27; Hos. 2:15[13]) and forget — i.e., do not keep — Yahweh's commandments and demands (Dt. 4:23; 6:12; 8:11,[14],19; 26:13; 2 K. 17:38; Hos. 4:6). Although some scholars adduce the analogous use of the lexeme "forget" in ancient Near Eastern treaties in explaining the Dtn/Dtr inclination to use this verb,[10] it probably represents rather the influence of the language of Hosea (Hos. 2:15[13]; 4:6;

---

10. See F. C. Fensham, "Malediction and Benediction in Ancient Near Eastern Vassal-Treaties and the OT," *ZAW* 74 (1962) 1-9.

What reviewers have said about *TDOT:*

"The *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* is a monumental contribution to the study of the Old Testament, and very highly recommended. No library can afford to be without it." — ***Hebrew Studies***

"Provides a much-needed resource into the language of the Old Testament, particularly as it relates to the ancient Near East. . . . A must for any serious student of the Old Testament." — ***Southwestern Journal of Theology***

"A tool that no Bible student can afford to ignore; it takes its place alongside Kittel as a classic reference work." — ***Christianity Today***

"Students of the Bible have cause for rejoicing as each volume of this scholarly work appears. . . . This 'theological dictionary' focuses on the etymology of Hebrew terms, then explores their cultural and historical contexts, finally suggesting their importance in a theological framework without espousing a particular denominational bias."

— ***American Reference Books Annual***

"An important and interesting scholastic tool, essential for any library that serves serious Bible students, theological scholars, church-school teachers, pastors, or interested laypeople."

— ***Choice***

"*[TDOT]* amasses a great deal of useful information (including bibliography) on the words dealt with, which most scholars would find difficult to ferret out on their own. . . . Clearly, no serious exegete of the Old Testament should overlook it."

— ***Journal of the American Academy of Religion***

"This series will long remain a classic work, a storehouse of information, well organized and carefully judged and nuanced. Every major biblical library should possess it."

— ***The Bible Today***

"Serious students of the Hebrew Bible will find this dictionary a valuable resource."

— ***Journal of Biblical Literature***

ISBN 0-8028-2345-9

9 780802 823458

WM. B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING CO.
Grand Rapids/Cambridge

www.eerdmans.com